The overarching purpose of course, program and institutional level assessment implemented at Goodwin College is to ensure that your program’s mission and outcomes are realized in what your graduating students know, value and can do in their professional careers. Outcomes associated with the assessment initiatives presented in this report serve to document and measure how well students have met your high expectations for student learning and to map the many paths by which your students gain the skills, competencies and disciplinary attitudes demanded by the professional environments in which they currently -- or will someday -- serve and lead. These initiatives are designed to provide all program stakeholders (i.e., adjunct and faculty members, program directors and managers, staff and college administrators) with insight into whether your students are meeting explicit course, program and institutional learning outcomes and how well their cumulative learning experiences are helping them to achieve those anticipated outcomes.
The multi-method approach to assess learning outcomes used by Goodwin College programs, and demonstrated in this report, has been shaped by existing processes and values within our campus community and by research into best assessment practices in higher education. As Maki (2004) states, "Assessing for learning is a systematic and systemic process of inquiry into what and how well students learn over the progression of their studies and is driven by intellectual curiosity about the efficacy of collective educational practices." Broadly speaking, the immediate emphasis of the approach taken at Goodwin College centers on the value and subsequent use of both direct and indirect evidence gathered to a) improve and enhance student learning at the course level, b) examine the effectiveness of educational practices at the program level and c) contribute to the wider enterprise of measuring student learning priorities at the university level. The long-term emphasis of this approach, which weighs evidence obtained three-to-five years out (i.e., post-graduation), addresses the experienced impact in the work setting and vis-à-vis overall life satisfaction of attaining a high quality education from Drexel University.

II. Assessment as a System of Continuous Improvement

Goodwin College is dedicated to creating and sustaining a “culture of evidence” in which data about achievements in student learning and the experiences that support student learning are collected, analyzed, and shared for the purpose of continuous program improvement. Program Directors, Managers, faculty and adjuncts from each of the twenty degree-bearing programs, as well as the College’s Director of Assessment, share responsibility for the assessment of student learning outcomes, program outcomes and instructional effectiveness (see Figure One).

![Figure One: Focus of Goodwin College's System of Continuous Improvement](image-url)
The underpinnings of this evidence-based assessment culture stem from an innovative strategy, implemented in the fall 2011, to encourage sustainable assessment and evaluation processes. Using the metaphor of a “three-legged stool,” program directors and their faculty (including adjuncts), a college-wide assessment director, and a resource-intensive blog site called Data Points form the key elements of a comprehensive, sustained and integrated assessment paradigm to continuously engage regional and professional accreditation “best practices” for quality assurance.ii Key elements to this ongoing process include the collection and organization of:

1. Summative baseline data on assessment activities
2. Areas and levels of program director preparedness and need related to specific assessment activities
3. Specific assessment plans for course-, program- and school-level action and
4. Formative strategies to implement the assessment plans with an emphasis on using Data Points resources (the “third leg” of the stool) to address ACCE (and other) accreditation criteria, respond to faculty concerns via posts, and monitor ongoing progress and outcomes.

As this report will show, findings associated with these ongoing assessment efforts will help you to:

- Sustain a high quality program that aligns with Drexel University’s Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) and mission
- Highlight and promote your program’s strengths
- Identify and recommend areas for improvement via “Action Items”
- Support and nurture a culture of continuous assessment

III. Ten Assessment Guidelines at Goodwin College

At Goodwin College, the practice of continuous assessment has been guided by the following procedural guidelines:

1. Responsibility for course-level assessments resides with the Program Director, Manager and faculty/adjunct members of each program. Each term, a subset of faculty and adjuncts will be selected for participation, in consultation with the Program Director and College’s Assessment Director. This “team” defines the appropriate assessment plan (e.g., which courses and program outcomes to assess) and is involved in carrying out the plan.

2. Program-level assessments focus on alignments between course-embedded student learning outcomes (SLOs) and the learning goals faculty establish for
each program of study, i.e., program outcomes (POs). These learning goals are written in terms of what students are expected to know, be able to do, and value (i.e., the competencies, skills and professional attitudes) on completion of their degree.

3. Comprehensive and integrated assessment at the course- and program-levels include alignments with Drexel University goals for student learning (DSLPs).

4. Student learning goals, and their assessment, pertain to all learning environments: classroom, distance and online learning, laboratory, practicum, and co-op and service-learning experiences.

5. Quantitative and qualitative assessment methods (i.e., the ways we obtain data on student learning) are practical, accurate and tell a meaningful story about the academic program, specifically, and College, as a whole. When relevant, they are informed by the standards relevant to the discipline, e.g., those established by professional accrediting bodies such as ABET and ACCE.

6. All learning environments engaged in by students (see #4 above) provide suitable, feasible and attainable sources of assessment data.

7. Formative and summative outcomes derived from a program’s assessment activities are interpreted, communicated and used constructively to promote continuous program improvements and enhance instructional effectiveness.

8. Each term a program collects assessment data, Program Directors and Managers encourage participating faculty and/or adjuncts to reflect upon the outcomes and improve the assessment process by “closing the loop.”

9. Program Directors, Managers and their faculty/adjuncts will work with the Goodwin College Assessment Director to facilitate numbers 1-8 above.

10. Program Directors, Managers and faculty/adjuncts will show evidence of the accomplishment of up to fifteen assessment activity areas (see Table One on the next page) and, whenever needed, solicit answers to assessment-related questions through the College’s Director of Assessment and/or resources available at Data Points, the online assessment blog site designed for Goodwin College instructors who are engaged in the systematic and ongoing assessment of student learning.
TABLE ONE: Fifteen Assessment Activity Areas that Impact Performance at the Course, Program, School and College Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</th>
<th>2. Developing Student Learning Assessment Plans</th>
<th>3. Developing Program Outcomes (POs)</th>
<th>4. Developing Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)</th>
<th>5. Mapping SLOs to Program Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What we learn through the ten above-cited assessment principles helps the College determine how best to support needed curricular and programmatic changes. In addition, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, Goodwin’s assessment initiatives enable program, college and university administrators to evaluate the achievements (via outcomes) of our graduates in relation to their program’s goals and, more broadly, the student learning priorities centered in the University’s mission (i.e., the DSLPs). *Ultimately, the assessment initiatives carried out at Goodwin College provide the framework to promote student learning and development, evaluate the achievement of program and institutional outcomes, and enhance instructional effectiveness.*

IV. Program Assessment Methodology, 2011-2013

In this report, survey- and interview-based data (i.e., text, numeric information and mappings) obtained from the fall 2011 Baseline Goodwin College Assessment Survey (see Appendix A), follow-up spring 2012 Program Assessment Review (see Appendix B), fall 2012 Program Director Process Interview (see Appendix C), and spring 2013 Status of Program Assessment Survey (see Appendix D) are integrated and summarized to provide CMGT stakeholders with the most current programmatic information and insight associated with ten fundamental questions on program assessment that are common to these temporal studies. These questions were initially developed in response to a 2011 Provost Office directive to obtain program-
level data from all Colleges at Drexel University in advance of the MSCHE (“Middle States”) site visit in the spring 2012. The focus was to determine achievement levels of the Program Learning Goals for 2012. In response, in September 2011, a two-part Baseline Goodwin College Assessment Report was developed and submitted to Dr. William Lynch, Dean of Goodwin College (click here for Part I and Part II).

This report tracks program-level activities and achievements between the fall 2011 and summer 2013, using survey and interview data obtained from the CMGT Program Director and Manager. Where appropriate, evidence (e.g., mappings, assessment plans, examples of course-level assessment) is provided that documents the outcome of each assessment activity. This report is organized based on the following ten research questions:

1. Do all course syllabi contain statements of expected student learning outcomes? Are all syllabi located in AEFIS for access, potential modification and assessment purposes?

2. Is a student learning assessment plan in place that indicates an assessment schedule and process by which faculty are engaged to "close the loop"?

3. Has a mission statement been developed for this program? From this mission statement, have explicit Program Outcomes been developed? Are all POs in AEFIS?

4. If relevant to your program, have explicit Program Educational Objectives been developed for this program?

5. For each course in your program, have student learning outcomes and other educational experiences (e.g., co-op) been mapped to program outcomes? Into AEFIS?

6. Have Program Outcomes been mapped to Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) for this program? Into AEFIS?

7. If your program involves co-op, have employer and student co-op surveys ...
   a. documented student achievement of program outcomes to DSLPs?
   b. been used to inform decisions about student learning in the program?
   c. been used to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?

8. For your program, has at least one program outcome been assessed using a direct (e.g., course assessment, capstone) or indirect assessment method (e.g., employer and student surveys)?

9. Has an annual (or interim) assessment report been submitted that contains academic year findings and planned steps to be taken by faculty to "close the loop"?

10. Have assessment outcomes (i.e., results) been communicated to the program's faculty or involved the faculty in some way? If so, in what ways?
Assessment Activity “Preparedness Rubric”

An important part of the analysis used across the three assessment surveys is a five-point “Preparedness Rubric” (see Figure Two), developed by Drs. Ziner and Aghayere, which will be applied to each of the above-cited research questions. This rubric ranges from “1” (“Not Prepared”) to “5” (“Fully Prepared”). To allow for flexibility, a program may fall “in between” the rubric’s conceptual categories, since there are multiple ways to define and apply each category to past and present states of an academic program. Such degrees of freedom would not only produce a greater fit between the current state of ongoing assessment in an academic program and the perception of its Program Director/Manager, but it will also provide for greater variability and, hence, the potential for more powerful pre- and post-descriptive and inferential statistical analyses in this report.

Assessment Activity “Need for Assistance” Scale

A second essential part of this temporal analysis is a four-point rating scale that is designed to assess the level of need for assistance in each of the fundamental assessment activities examined (see Figure Three). In each assessment study, this scale was used for planning purposes. Program Directors who report levels of need that were less than “4” (“No Assistance is Needed”) in one or more areas were contacted and appropriate training was coordinated and implemented. In this report, current “need for assistance” levels are compared to previous levels to determine if, and in which areas, training is needed moving forward.
The rationale for documenting and measuring “preparedness” and “need” connected to each fundamental assessment activity over time (refer back to Table One) stems from two interrelated issues. First, there is a necessity to evaluate the level of change, as a percent, in assessment-related accomplishments and self-reported need over time among programs (vis-à-vis their respective Program Directors and Managers) for the purpose of effective, individualized planning. The Baseline Goodwin College Assessment Report combined with this report exemplify these summative and formative processes. Second, between the fall 2011 and summer 2013, Goodwin College’s School of Technology and Professional Studies replaced four of six Program Directors (66.6 percent) and two of six Program Managers (33.3 percent) due to attrition. The implications are that, moving forward, programs under new administrative leadership will require updated baseline measures on “preparedness” and “need” to incorporate their experience and skill levels into the program’s existing assessment plan.

**Two Assessment Dashboards**

A critical third part of this analysis is your program’s two assessment dashboards. The Assessment Activities Dashboard provides baseline (2011) and current (2013) “at-a-glance” summaries of the achievements made by the Program Director, Manager and faculty/adjunct members in relation to the program’s involvement across the fifteen assessment activity areas that are germane to your program. The dashboard also is designed to show if, and to what extent, goals established in the Baseline Goodwin College Assessment Report were achieved using a simple color-coded scheme: Gold indicates the goal is met, Yellow indicates the goal is within ten percent of being met, and RED reveals that the goal falls more than 10 percent below being met (see Table Two). The Assessment Assistance Dashboard is a formative planning tool used as a benchmark for measuring change in the Program Director’s level of need for assistance across the fifteen assessment activity areas now and into the future (see Table Three).

The Provost’s Office at Drexel University (i.e., the IRAE) requires the collection and presentation of evidence showing if, and in what way, each activity area was accomplished. The Assessment Activities Dashboard provides a base of evidence to address this institutional requirement alongside the regional accreditation requirements of the MSCHE (“Middle States”), because of its summative role in documenting, measuring and evaluating continuous assessment efforts at the course and program levels. Moreover, your program’s outcomes beginning in Section V, coupled with assessment evidence presented in Section VI, provide important information for your Program Alignment and Review (PAR) self-study, as set forth in the Office of the Provost’s PAR guidelines.

The status of program assessment for the B.S. Program in Construction Management will now be examined.
V. Assessment Outcomes for the B.S. Program in Construction Management

Data Sources and Procedure: In August 2011, the Program Director of the B.S. and M.S. in Construction Management, located in Goodwin College’s School of Technology and Professional Studies (SoTAPS), participated in the Goodwin College Baseline Study.\(^1\) This individual also took part in the follow-up Program Assessment Review (March-May 2012), which was designed to collect program-level data not fully captured in the baseline survey. In the following summer 2012, a new Program Director took the helm of the CMGT Program.\(^\text{ix}\)

In the fall 2012, SoTAPS Program Directors were requested to complete a brief, open-ended, process interview (see Appendix C) designed to gather information on their perception and experience with their program’s assessment efforts to-date. In the spring 2013, Program Directors and Managers completed the Status of Program Assessment Survey (see Appendix D), which served as the posttest to the College's 2011 baseline survey. The new CMGT Program Director participated in both of these assessment surveys. The implications of the change in leadership, for this report, are that the focus will be on the many changes and accomplishments in assessment-related activities between the baseline and follow-up surveys. In keeping with a formative emphasis in this report, for planning purposes, an analysis is provided of the new CMGT Program Director's self-reported “level of need” for assistance associated with each of the previously cited assessment activities.

In this section, the CMGT Program's survey results are detailed vis-à-vis ten research questions, which stem from the 2011 Provost Office’s directive, to document and measure the course, direction and quality of continuous program assessment. To simplify the presentation of these results across all assessment activity areas, two dashboards are provided. The first, an Assessment Activities Dashboard, examines the quantity and quality of assessment activities carried out between the fall 2011 and summer 2013 (see Table Two). The second, an Assessment Assistance Dashboard, addresses the level of need for assistance reported by the Program Director moving forward into the 2013-2014 AY (see Table Three).

---

\(^1\)The CMGT Program Manager also participated in this online survey, by assisting the Program Director in responding to survey items and gathering a record of evidence requested in the survey.
TABLE TWO: Comparison of CMGT Assessment Activities Achieved through an Assessment Activities Dashboard, Fall 2011–Summer 2013 (Panel One of Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activity Area</th>
<th>Activity Achieved, Fall 2011?</th>
<th>Preparedness Rubric Score (Fall 2011) (1-5 Scale)</th>
<th>Activity Achieved, Summer 2013?</th>
<th>Preparedness Rubric Score (Sum 2013) (1-5 Scale)</th>
<th>Was the Baseline Goal of “≥4” Achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do all course syllabi for this program contain statements of expected student learning outcomes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does this degree program have a student learning assessment plan indicating the schedule for assessing your program outcomes and the process by which you intend to ‘close the loop’ and engage your faculty in the assessment process?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does this degree program have one or more explicit program outcomes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does this degree program have one or more explicit program educational objectives (PEOs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For this degree program, have the student learning outcomes in your courses and other educational experiences (e.g., Co-ops) been mapped to your program outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For this degree program, have your Program Learning Outcomes been mapped to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of your program outcomes and the DSLPs?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** An “X” placed in the grid indicates a “yes” response from the Program Director when asked if a specific program assessment activity had been completed at the time of the fall 2011 and summer 2013 online surveys. Directors were then asked to submit the documents in question (or a timeframe for their receipt). Each numeric value is a “Level of Preparedness” score for a specific assessment activity. Each score is issued by the Director of Assessment at Goodwin College at the conclusion of each respective survey. The range is from “1” (“Not Prepared”) to “5” (“Fully Prepared”) based on the “Preparedness Rubric” described in Section IV of this report.
### TABLE TWO: Comparison of CMGT Assessment Activities Achieved through an Assessment Activities Dashboard, Fall 2011–Summer 2013 (Panel Two of Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activity Area</th>
<th>Activity Achieved, Fall 2011?</th>
<th>Preparedness Rubric Score (Fall 2011) (1-5 Scale)</th>
<th>Activity Achieved, Summer 2013?</th>
<th>Preparedness Rubric Score (Sum 2013) (1-5 Scale)</th>
<th>Was the Baseline Goal of “≥4” Achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree Program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. For this degree program, have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using a DIRECT assessment method (e.g., course assessments, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. For this degree program, have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using an INDIRECT assessment method (e.g., student, employer, alumni and industry advisory board surveys)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For this degree program, have you communicated assessment outcomes to program faculty?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. For this degree program, do you currently have an annual assessment report indicating your assessment findings for the academic year and what steps you and your faculty plan to take to correct any deficiencies (i.e., ‘close the loop’)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are faculty involved in the outcomes assessment activities for this degree program.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS BY YEAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.3%</strong> (9 of 14)</td>
<td><strong>Mean= 3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong> (14 of 14)</td>
<td><strong>Mean= 4.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The summative statistics at the bottom of this panel are program-level measures. The first, as a percentage, indicates the total percentage of assessment activities performed at the time of each survey (i.e., quantity, not quality). By adding the assigned “Level of Preparedness” scores and dividing by their total number, the second summative measure, a mean, is calculated. A mean suggests quality via the assessment preparedness rubric described in Section IV of this report.
**Interpreting Two Dashboards**

**Assessment Activities Dashboard:** Between the fall 2011 and summer 2013, the CMGT Program has made sizable gains in the number of assessment activities performed and the quality of the deliverables associated with each activity (see Table Two). The Program Director has worked very hard, in consultation with Goodwin College’s Director of Assessment, to see to it that these advancements took place. In fall 2011, 9 of 14 (64.3 percent) of all assessment activities involved program faculty. At that time, fundamental assessment tasks were just being considered: the implementation of a learning assessment plan based on SLO-PO alignments and clear metrics, use of co-op data to determine how well job experiences align with DSLPs, and the development of curricular mappings to name a few. Presently, 100 percent of all assessment activity areas are being performed in the CMGT Program.

Moreover, by working together as a team, the quality of the work performed and evidence produced also increased. The mean “Level of Preparedness” score jumped from 3.9 to 4.5, i.e., a 15.4 percent increase. A good example of enhanced quality can be found in the course-level student assessment plan currently used in the program (see Section VI, Number 2). An important summative dimension of this dashboard is the color-coded scheme in the right-side margin. One of the goals found in the 2011 baseline report was the need for the quality of each assessment activity to be “4” or greater, as measured via the “Level of Preparedness” rubric. Results indicate that this goal has been met across each activity area and for the program as a whole (mean=4.5).

**Assessment Assistance Dashboard:** Another goal found in the 2011 baseline report was the “Level of Need for Assistance” score to be equal to “4” (“No Assistance Needed”) for all assessment activities, as measured via each survey’s rubric. With the change in CMGT Program leadership in mid-summer 2012, this goal cannot be assessed at this time. However, scores documented in the summer 2013 can be used as a benchmark for measuring change in the Program Director’s level of need for assistance in the future (see Table Three). At present, nine of fourteen areas (64.3 percent) require a “moderate amount” of assistance, according to the new Program Director, with an overall program mean of 2.4. None of the assessment activity areas require “no assistance.”

**Student Learning Outcomes (Q1)**

The first research question asks: “Do all course syllabi in your program contain statements of expected student learning outcomes (SLOs)? Are all syllabi located in AEFIS for access, potential modification and assessment purposes?”

Results indicate that 100 percent of your program’s SLOs appear in syllabi located in AEFIS. Evidence to support the presence of SLOs in AEFIS-housed syllabi offered
each term, or in the aggregate, can be attained by following the procedures found in Section VI of this report (see **Number 1**).

Related to this issue, as your program becomes more fully integrated into AEFIS (i.e., moves from Levels One and Two to Levels Three and Four), program administrators will need to become experienced in AEFIS-based procedures to (a) align each course’s SLOs with your program’s outcomes and (b) establish metrics to determine what threshold needs to be met, before the full range of formative and summative assessment capabilities in AEFIS can take place.

**Action Items**

- The Program Director and Manager should be clear about connections between syllabi objectives and student learning outcomes in their ongoing assessment efforts. Each syllabus in AEFIS contains course objectives, which are usually listed on the first page. There may be a few objectives or more than one dozen objectives, depending on the course and field of study. *These objectives are course-embedded student learning outcomes (SLOs). A course assessment may involve a few (2-3) SLOs or all of them. Most often, only 2-3 SLOs are assessed in a given term. The number of SLOs selected, and how to envision their relationship to program outcomes, is explained in a Data Points blog titled “How to Connect Course-Embedded Learning Objectives to Program Outcomes Through Metrics: It’s all in the Syllabus.” To access this discussion, click [here](#).*

- Program Directors need to communicate to faculty and adjuncts the need for clear and precise language that defines student-learning outcomes in course syllabi. In addition to the above-cited blog, consider referring those instructors who participate in course-level assessment to a Data Points blog titled, “Revisiting the Distinction between ‘Student Learning Objectives’ and ‘Outcomes.’” To access this discussion, click [here](#).

- If not already familiar with the ability to access AEFIS to view or download course syllabi, the Program Director and Manager should seek AEFIS training through the College’s Director of Assessment or through on-campus training sessions.

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about the development of SLOs for assessment purposes, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“3”) for Q1, i.e., “a small amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.
TABLE THREE: Comparison of Assessment Activity “Level of Need” Reported by CMGT Program Director, Fall 2011–Summer 2013 (Panel One of Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Program Directors rate their need for assistance in each of the following assessment activity areas</th>
<th>Level of Need Rubric Scale Score, Fall 2011 (1-4 Scale)</th>
<th>Level of Need Rubric Scale Score, Summer 2013 (1-4 Scale)</th>
<th>Was the 2011 baseline goal of “4” achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing your program’s (student learning) assessment plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing Program Outcomes (POs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mapping SLOs to Program Outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mapping Program Outcomes to DSLPs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Using Co-Op Surveys to Document Achieving DSLPs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Due to the arrival of a new Program Director in the summer 2012, this question cannot be addressed. However, summer 2013 data on the current Program Director can be used as a benchmark to compare to his “Level of Need for Assistance” scores obtained in subsequent years so that this goal can be assessed.
TABLE THREE: Comparison of Assessment Activity “Level of Need” Reported by CMGT Program Director, 9/2011 – 9/2013 (Panel Two of Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT ASSISTANCE DASHBOARD</th>
<th>Level of Need Rubric Scale Score, Fall 2011 (1-4 Scale)</th>
<th>Level of Need Rubric Scale Score, Summer 2013 (1-4 Scale)</th>
<th>Was the 2011 baseline goal of “4” achieved?¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Program Directors rate their need for assistance in each of the following assessment activity areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Using Co-Op Surveys to Inform Decisions about Ways to Improve Surveys.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assessing at Least One PO with a DIRECT Measure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Assessing at Least One PO with an Indirect Measure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Determining which Direct or Indirect Measure Best Assesses POs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developing an Annual Assessment Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Involving Program Faculty in Outcomes Assessment Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Column Totals by Year</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See footnote under prior panel (i.e., Table Three, Panel One).

**Student Learning Assessment Plans (Q2)**

The second research question asks, “Does this degree program have a student learning assessment plan indicating the schedule for assessing your program outcomes and the process by which you intend to ‘close the loop’ and engage your faculty in the assessment process?”

**Through the summer 2013**, two interdependent approaches have been undertaken in Goodwin College to engage programs in course-level assessment plans of student learning. These two approaches (or “assessment tools”) involve the use of the One Question/One Answer and the Course-Level Assessment Report.
The **One Question/One Answer** approach (or “1Q/1A”) is a six-step primer, often used when a program is first introduced to course-level assessment. The 1Q/1A is designed to take instructors through the assessment process by selecting and assessing the alignment between one SLO, PO and DSLP. The focus is on process and, ultimately, what to do when the numbers are in. Here, the instructor discovers how to recognize and, in turn, act on the need to “close the loop” (see the 1Q/1A in Section VI, Number 2).

The **Course-Level Assessment Report** is designed, in part, to integrate 1Q/1A results into a spreadsheet-like environment over the duration the course is run (e.g., quarters). In addition to the information obtained through the above-cited 1Q/1A, this report adds three important features: 1) a temporal display of numeric (data) outcomes, 2) a trend analysis that combines the current term with the previous terms the course has been taught, and 3) an “action plan” for the current term with a specific focus on “closing the loop” (see the Course-Level Assessment Report in Section VI, Number 2).

Both tools facilitate your program’s continuous assessment efforts in the following ways:

- To assess student performance associated with course-embedded student learning outcomes (SLOs)
- To determine how well these learning outcomes align with (i.e., achieve) program outcomes (POs) and university-wide learning priorities (i.e., DSLPs)
- To document and measure continuous program improvement, including efforts to involve instructors in “closing the loop.”
- In short, to help instructors envision alignments between chosen SLOs, POs and DSLPs and weigh the implications of alignment outcomes for course planning

**From the Director’s Desk ...**

How well prepared is your program to begin (or continue) assessing one or more of its program outcomes?

“CMGT is well prepared as a result of the ACCE self study and the groundwork established by Z. Torbica and Drew Ziner.”

~ Bob Muir, Ph.D.
Fall 2012

**To-date, the CMGT program has a moderately developed assessment plan.** An assessment plan indicates the schedule for assessment of your program outcomes, the process by which you intend to “close the loop,” and the time frame of other continuous assessment activities to which your program is fully engaged. The CMGT Program’s assessment energies are guided, in large part, by standards and procedures governed by the American Council on Construction Education (ACCE) to which it is fully accredited. However, course-level assessment has taken on a more
empirically grounded approach than the ACCE presently requires and, in fact, is more closely modeled after MSCHE standards and practices. This difference in quantifying and qualifying course-based SLOs to align with POs is new to the CMGT Program and is part of the reason why the program currently receives a “moderately developed” rating by the PI of this report. Another reason stems from the need to expand the current roster of instructors involved in course-level assessment. This point was emphasized by CMGT’s Program Director when he indicated that his newfound skill set at course assessment would be enthusiastically communicated to his fellow faculty colleagues in the 2013-2014 AY. The goal will be to involve other faculty in this process of continuous program improvement.

*As of the fall 2013*, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness (IRAE) of the Provost’s Office has broadened the role of each Goodwin College program in using AEFIS so each program is soon to be in a position to assess course-level and program-level outcomes using this campus-based software program. Up to this point in time, Goodwin College programs remained at Levels One and Two (i.e., mainly archiving course descriptions and SLOs along with having access to course-based surveys and evaluations). With access to Levels Three and Four, minimally, programs also will be able to upload and monitor their POs, align (map) SLOs, POs and DSLPs, assign metrics to the SLOs, enter assessment data, and generate reports associated with course- and program-level outcomes.

**Action Items**

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the Director of Assessment to review the 1Q/1A as a heuristic for use with instructors new to course-level assessment. By the outset of the winter 2013-2014 term, the following assessment activities should be addressed:
  - Select 2-3 Program Outcomes to be assessed in the coming term
  - Select 1-3 instructors to participate in the term’s assessment process
  - Select 2-3 SLOs in each instructor’s course to be assessed, and assign metrics and methods to document, measure and assess each SLO
  - Have the instructors meet with the Director of Assessment to review the steps involved, including use of the 1Q/1A, AEFIS and the “Closing the Loop” exercise to envision and develop an effective assessment report
  - Work with the Director of Assessment to upload into AEFIS the necessary alignments and metrics needed to assessment POs
o Implement an assessment plan on a three-year cycle that is structured similar to the one found [here] at Data Points

• The Program Director and Manager should attend an AEFIS training session designed to examine the benefits of AEFIS as a tool to facilitate course-, program- and university-wide assessment.

• The Program Director and Manager should meet with the Director of Assessment on a monthly basis to address all questions and process concerns (including those from participating faculty) related to their program’s assessment plan to ensure such efforts are carried out in an effective, timely and coherent manner.

• The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address concerns about the development of a program assessment plan, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“2”) for Q2, i.e., “a moderate amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.

**Mission and Program Outcomes (Q3)**

The third research question asks, “Does this degree program have or more explicit program outcomes?” Results of this program evaluation show that the CMGT Program, in fact, has fully developed program outcomes (see Section VI, Number 3). These POs were vetted on several occasions with both past and current Program Directors. They are also found on the program’s Goodwin College website.

An important component of developing POs is to link each outcome to the program’s mission statement. In this context, the CMGT Program has developed a succinct mission statement that captures what prospect students need to know “at-a-glance.”

**Action Items**

• The Program Director and Manager should revisit the program’s mission statement and program outcomes no less than once every two years to determine if (a) there’s room for wordsmithing or enhancements, (b) there are changes in the field that warrant one or more revisions or updates, and/or (c) there are program-level changes (e.g., in personnel or sources of funding) that also warrant updates.
• If not already familiar with the ability to access AEFIS to upload program outcomes, the Program Director and Manager should seek AEFIS training through the College’s Director of Assessment or through on-campus training sessions. Opportunities to meet as a group with instructors participating in course-level assessment can be arranged.

• The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about the development or refinement of their program’s outcomes (or mission statement), as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“2”) for Q3, i.e., “a moderate amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.

• For a refresher discussion on how to construct your program’s vision and mission statements, please refer to a Data Points blog titled, “On Constructing Your Program’s Mission.” To access this discussion, click here.

Program Educational Objectives (Q4)

The fourth research question asks, “If relevant to your program, have explicit Program Educational Objectives been developed for this program?

For the CMGT Program, Program Educational Objectives (PEOs) are required by the ACCE professional accrediting council. PEOs refer to the knowledge, skills and professional attitudes we expect our program graduates to have (and demonstrate) 3-5 years beyond graduation. The PEOs established by the CMGT Program are well-developed, multi-dimensional and designed to capture important information about the program’s quality and success (see Section VI, Number 4). Such data can be obtained systematically through annual survey-based studies of alumni.

Action Items

• The Program Director and Manager should review their alumni (PEO) study, in concert with the Director of Assessment, to address the following:

  o Ensure the validity and reliability of each PEO to be documented, measured and assessed

---

2 Programs that are not professionally accredited have the option of documenting and measuring PEOs as part of their assessment plans. The establishment of PEOs is not a requirement of regional accrediting commissions such as the MSCHE (“Middle States”).
Establish a sampling frame that can lead to a representative sample or choose to enumerate the entire population of program graduates

- Determine what statistical techniques are necessary to satisfy programmatic and professional accreditation needs
- Determine a schedule to implement annual alumni surveys
- Assign key faculty to develop an alumni report based on findings that meet programmatic needs and those of the ACCE

The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about the development or refinement of their program’s PEOs, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“3”) for Q3, i.e., “a small amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.

**Mapping of Student Learning Outcomes to Program Outcomes (Q5) and Program Outcomes to Drexel Student Learning Priorities (Q6)**

The fifth and sixth research questions, respectively, ask, “For each course in your program, have student learning outcomes and other educational experiences (e.g., co-op) been mapped to program outcomes? Into AEFIS?” and “Have Program Outcomes been mapped to Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) for this program? Into AEFIS?”

The CMGT has conceived and developed a small number of useful curricular mappings of alignments between SLOs and POs (see Section VI, Number 5). The program also has mapped its POs with university-wide DSLPs (see Section VI, Number 6). In both cases, the PI of this report applies a rating of “5” (“fully prepared”) to each mapping. *Mappings that are designed to align course-embedded student learning outcomes to program outcomes need to be expanded to all courses in the CMGT curriculum in the 2013-2014 AY.*

Although strides have been made in the development of curricular mappings, at present, none have been uploaded into AEFIS for subsequent use in program assessment efforts. *All mappings that align course-embedded student learning outcomes to program outcomes and, in turn, program outcomes to DSLPs should be uploaded into AEFIS by the end of the winter term 2014.*

**Action Items**

- Program Directors and Managers should work with all instructors to align course-embedded student learning outcomes to program outcomes so the entire curriculum has achieved this mapping activity by the end of the 2013-2014 AY.
- All mappings that align course-embedded student learning outcomes to program outcomes and, in turn, program outcomes to DSLPs should be uploaded into AEFIS by the end of the winter term 2014.

- The Program Director and Manager should seek AEFIS training through the College’s Director of Assessment or through on-campus training sessions to be able to upload program outcomes into AEFIS and, in turn, establish alignments between these POs and existing course-embedded SLOs. To satisfy this programmatic need, opportunities to meet as a group with instructors participating in course-level assessment can be arranged for training purposes.

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about the further development and/or expansion of curricular mappings, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“2”) for Q5 and Q6, i.e., “a moderate amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.

### Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys for Assessment Purposes (Q7a, Q7b and Q7c)

The seventh research question centers on the collection and use of SCDC co-op survey data. The three-pronged survey item asks, “If your program involves a co-op, have employer and student co-op surveys ...

7a. documented student achievement of program outcomes to DSLPs?
7b. been used to inform decisions about student learning in the program?
7c. been used to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?”

### Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Document Student Achievement of POs and DSLPs (Q7a)

The CMGT program is just beginning to use student and employer survey data, available through the SCDC, to document students’ achievement of program outcomes and DSLPs. Evidence is provided of the co-op student experience being used to document alignments with university-wide DSLPs (see Section VI, Number 7a). However, at present, no program level outcome items are listed in the Student Evaluation of Employment Survey (see Section D in Appendix F).

Aligning student evaluations with DSLPs: Section C of the Student Evaluation of Employment Survey (see Appendix F) is designed to document and measure specific
survey items and their corresponding alignments with Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs). At the conclusion of the co-op cycle, employees (i.e., Drexel students) responded to the following, “Using the scale provided, please rate your performance against colleagues at your company/organization at the same experience level.”

Analysis of student evaluations associated with their employment (see Section VI, Number 7a) indicates that all fifteen items have met the threshold of being aligned with our campus DSLPs. The range of mean scores is from 3.64 (std. dev. = 1.2) to 4.36 (std. dev. = .99). Future analysis of student evaluations may warrant increasing the threshold to “4” or higher, depending on the level of rigor the program wishes to implement in relation to DSLP alignments.

Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Inform Decisions about Student Learning (Q7b)

The CMGT program also uses student and employer survey data to inform decisions about student learning. Evidence is provided of student evaluations of the co-op work environment and employer evaluations of CMGT students’ work ethic.

Evaluating the quality of the work environment:
Section B of the Student Evaluation of Employment Survey (see Appendix F) is designed to evaluate the quality of the work experience through ten survey items using a 5-point Likert scale (see the inset to the right). Employees (i.e., Drexel students) responded to the following, “Reflecting on your entire co-op experience, please indicate how each of the following areas aligned with your expectations.”

---

3 The following standard assessment criterion is used to gauge the threshold of achievement (or success) of a survey item’s outcome statement: To assert that a survey item’s outcome has been achieved (i.e., in this case, that a survey item aligns with its associated DSLP), respondents will score a mean of “3” or higher on survey items, where 3 = “Average,” 4 = “Good” and 5 = “Excellent”.
Analysis of student evaluations of their job experience shows that all ten items met the threshold of “good” (“3”) or greater. These outcomes indicate that, in all areas examined, the co-op work experience at least met our students’ expectations. The range of mean scores is from 3.61 (std. dev. = .89) to 4.09 (std. dev. = .76), with an “Overall Job Satisfaction” rating that reveals the work experience exceeded the students’ expectations (i.e., mean =4.0, std. dev = .93).

**Employer evaluation of the student’s work ethic:**
Section A of the *Employer Evaluation of Employee Survey* is designed to evaluate the work ethic of each co-op student against all other company employees at the same experience level using a 5-point Likert scale (see the inset to the right). Employers responded to the following, “Please assess the student’s performance in the following areas ...” (see Appendix G).

Analysis of employer evaluations of CMGT co-op students’ work ethic (see Section VI, Number 7C) shows that all ten items met the threshold of “good” (“3”) or greater. This set of student “work ethic” outcomes indicates that, in all areas examined, the employer held supportive views of our students. The range of mean scores is from 3.64 for leadership (std. dev. = 1.6) to 4.6 for attendance (std. dev. = .71), with an overall work ethic mean of 4.2 (std. dev. = .97) for this group of CMGT co-op students.

**Aligning employer ratings with DSLPs:** Section B of the *Employer Evaluation of Employee Survey* is designed to document and measure specific survey items and their corresponding alignments with Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs). At the conclusion of the co-op cycle, employers responded to the following, “Please assess the student’s ability on each of the following outcomes as demonstrated during the co-op experience” (see Appendix G).

Employer evaluation outcomes (see Section VI, Number 7D) indicate that all fifteen items have met the threshold of being aligned with our campus DSLPs. The range of mean scores is from 3.68 (std. dev. = 1.3) to 4.4 (std. dev. = .91). As noted earlier, upcoming analyses in this area may warrant raising the threshold level to “4” (“Very Good”) or higher to increase programmatic standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated on the Following Scale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5=Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0=Unable to Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Improve the Surveys (Q7c)

Because no program level outcomes are present in the student co-op survey, the CMGT Program should contact the SCDC to update the current survey with current program outcomes.

Action Items for Questions 7a-7c

- The Program Director should contact the SCDC to integrate current program outcome items into Section D of the Student Evaluation of Employment Survey.

- The Program Director and Manager should review how employer and student co-op surveys can be analyzed for improved conceptual clarity, enhanced ties to POs and DSLPs, and item internal consistency.

- The Program Director and Manager should continue to explore ways to use employer and student co-op survey outcomes to inform decisions about student learning.

- The Program Director and Manager should communicate to faculty involved in course-level assessment how employer and student co-op surveys document the achievement of POs and DSLPs.

- The Program Director and Manager should consider increasing the threshold of student and employer co-op evaluations to “4” on a 5-point scale to enhance the level of rigor and quality expected from your program. This should be seen as a goal to be achieved and sustained over time.

- As the Program Director and Manager review co-op employer reports and co-op student evaluations connected with your program, consider the following:

  1. A process should be in place where all obtained co-op survey data is archived and available, i.e., hard copies or electronically, for summative (this is what we found) and formative (this is what needs fixing) reviews;

  2. Craft a paragraph or two that briefly states how co-op data has been used to make program improvements (e.g., revising course content to better reflect the students’ skill set required by companies participating in the co-op, assessing data to create a better student-organizational fit, etc.); and
3. Keep an electronic journal throughout each term that demonstrates the process briefly described in #2 above actually occurred (i.e., a document that succinctly describes who was involved, what was decided and why, what programmatic changes were implemented and, over time, evidence from follow-up co-op survey data that the needed change did, in fact, address the problem/concern identified in the original co-op survey results).

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about the use of student and employer co-op data, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“2”) for Q7a and Q7b, i.e., “a moderate amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area, and (“3”) for Q7c, i.e., “a small amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.

- The co-op data presented in this report should be seen as a benchmark. Moving forward, contact your Assessment Director to help facilitate this process as a new cycle of co-op data become available for your program through the SCDC at the end of each academic year.

**Assessing Program Outcomes Using Direct and Indirect Assessment Methods (Q8)**

The eighth research question asks, “For your program, has at least one program outcome been assessed using a direct (e.g., course assessment, capstone) or indirect assessment method (e.g., employer and student surveys)?”

**Direct Assessment**

The CGMT program currently is involved in the direct assessment of program outcomes. The Program Director is currently working on using direct measures to assess student performance in terms of SLOs, PO, and DSLPs (see Section VI, Course Level Assessment Report). Based on his spring term 2013 experience, and feedback from the Director of Assessment, the Program Director

---

**From the Director’s Desk …**

Program Directors were asked to list 1-2 strengths that characterize their program's assessment efforts at this time.

- Having an initial assessment framework in place
- Having a repository and data collection process in place
- We have moved to making assessment a topic of discussion at each CMGT Faculty meeting which will in turn be recorded in the minutes of each meeting

~ Bob Muir, Ph.D.  
Fall 2012
indicated he will guide other full-time faculty through the process. According to the Program Director, “Full implementation is expected in AY 2013-14.”

**Indirect Assessments**

There are several examples of indirect evidence being used for assessment purposes in the CMGT Program (see Table Four). To address instructional effectiveness and stave off concerns by students about the way a course is progressing, a mid-course feedback survey takes place in the fourth week of each term. Information from mid-course feedback surveys is made immediately available to individual faculty members and program administrators and allows for ongoing improvement of instruction and course content.

The end-of-term course evaluations, completed by students, provide opportunities to examine how well courses address specific student learning outcomes (SLOs). Data from these evaluations is compiled and reported on a quarterly basis for the programs and the university.

| TABLE FOUR: ROLE OF INDIRECT MEASURES IN THE CMGT PROGRAM’S ASSESSMENT PLAN |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Location                                        | Formative (F)   | Summative (S)   | Both F & S      | Location        |
| Mid-course feedback survey                      | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | AEFIS           |
| End-term student course evaluation              | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | AEFIS           |
| Senior exit survey                              | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | IRAE/SCDC       |
| SCDC student co-op survey                       | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | SCDC            |
| SCDC employer co-op survey                      | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | SCDC            |
| Student capstone or e-portfolio                 | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | ![ ]           | Course          |

For an example of how direct and indirect evidence can work in tandem in course-level assessments, refer to Section VI, *Assessing Program Outcomes Using Direct and/or Indirect Assessment Methods*. 
Senior exit surveys also provide indirect evidence of program-level (POs) and university-level (DSLPS) learning outcomes. The SCDC student and employer co-op surveys, previously examined, address alignments between work experience, program outcomes and DSLPs (although the CMGT Program currently does not assess POs in the SCDC surveys). Finally, student capstone and e-portfolio course experiences offer indirect evidence of the achievement of program outcomes.

**Action Items**

- The Program Director should select 1-2 other persons in the fall 2013 term to participate in course-level assessment. This CMGT assessment team should meet with the Director of Assessment to address any issues or questions.

- The Program Director and Manager should recognize the various forms of direct and indirect assessment methods and be clear about the implication of their use (time, benefits, etc.). For a list of both forms of evidence, click here.

- The Program Director and Manager should communicate to their faculty the need to assess POs using direct and indirect assessment methods.
The Annual Assessment Report (Q9)

The ninth research question asks, “Has an annual (or interim) assessment report been submitted that contains academic year findings and planned steps to be taken by faculty to ‘close the loop’?” This document represents your first assessment report. Sections Five and Six each address how your program has taken steps to document and measure student learning, establish an assessment plan, and focus on the need to “close the loop” when assessment data fall short of a threshold set by your program.

However, as your program addresses action items contained in this report to expand and refine steps that have already begun, with particular attention directed to acquiring AEFIS training in Levels 3 and 4, an essential goal in the 2013-2014 AY is to introduce course assessment data into AEFIS and, in turn, generate an annual assessment report consistent with your programmatic needs and those specified by the ACCE.

Action Items

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the Assessment Director to review this Status of Program Assessment Report in terms of:
  - How best to address “action items” in the current and upcoming terms
  - How to coordinate AEFIS training, who should be involved and why
  - How to include new instructors in course-level assessment and integrate their good work (assessment data) into the interim or annual report
  - How to address issues raised regarding SCDC co-op surveys
  - Fielding any questions not addressed above or in this report

- The Program Director should feel confident that administrative support exists in its new academic home to develop annual assessment and ACCE accreditation reports, which include the involvement of program faculty when necessary.

- The Program Director and Manager should meet with the College’s Director of Assessment to address any concerns about developing their annual assessment report, as per the 2013 Assessment Assistance Dashboard score (“2”) for Q9, i.e., “a moderate amount of assistance is needed” in this assessment area.
Role of Assessment Outcomes in the Program (Q10)

The tenth and final research question asks, “Have assessment outcomes (i.e., results) been communicated to the program's faculty or involved the faculty in some way? If so, in what ways?

The CMGT Program has been integrating faculty and adjunct instructors into its ongoing assessment efforts since the program received full accreditation from the ACCE in 2010. Evidence that describes the ways the program has used assessment results to inform decisions about one or more aspects of the program are long-standing and well documented (see Section VI, Number 10). They include, but are not limited to, the review of course and program outcomes in faculty meeting discussions, committee level work, alumni surveys and the CMAC Curriculum Committee.

Action Items

- As the Program Director and Manager review the outcomes of course- and program-level assessment data each term, the following is suggested:

  1. A process should be in place where all obtained assessment data is archived and available in AEFIS for summative and formative reviews;

  2. Once reviewed, with the assistance of faculty colleagues (e.g., at a program meeting), develop a statement that describes how the outcomes can and will be used to make program improvements that include faculty and adjunct instructors (e.g., revising course content or selecting an alternative method of instructional delivery); and

  3. Keep an electronic journal each term that demonstrates the process briefly described in #2 above actually occurred, i.e., a document that succinctly describes who was involved, what was decided and why, what programmatic changes were implemented and, over time, evidence from follow-up assessment data (via “closing the loop”) that the needed change did, in fact, address the problem/concern identified in the original co-op survey results.

- The Program Director and Manager should identify ways to ensure that faculty and adjunct instructors involved in course-level assessment see the benefits and necessity of communicating their course assessment outcomes to the faculty.
Envoi

The 2011 *Baseline Goodwin College Assessment Report* concluded by stating, “The practice of assessment is at an important juncture at Goodwin College.” In light of the exciting structural transitions currently underway at the College, this statement is even more apropos today for the CMGT Program. The program has made many strides in areas of assessment over the past two years. Most notably, in areas related to direct assessment is it pertains to alignments between SLOs and POs, and in the many ways it communicates to colleagues the role of assessment outcomes in enhancing the quality of the program.

The assessment outcomes identified in this report, along with the range of specific “action items,” provide an important foundation moving forward for identifying and measuring growth among colleagues who are integrally involved in the practice of assessment, and throughout the CMGT program; where the ultimate goal is a sustained, integrated and comprehensive culture of assessment across all curricular facets of the Construction Management Program.
VI. Evidence of Assessment Outcomes for the B.S. Program in CMGT

1. Student Learning Outcomes (Q1)  

One hundred percent of all course syllabi in SoTAPS contain student-learning outcomes (i.e., SLOs, aka “Course Objectives”). Syllabi SLOs are located in AEFIS. To access your program’s courses and, in turn, view their respective SLOs, log into AEFIS. At the opening dashboard (on top left), go to COURSES -> COURSE SECTIONS & SYLLABI. In SEARCH RESULTS (see below), click SHOW ADVANCED SEARCH OPTIONS and the options window below will appear. Click DIVISION and select your program from the drop-down menu. Select the TERM you wish to view (e.g., “Fall 13-14”) and your school from the COLLEGE menu. Click Search and all courses for that selected term will populate the screen. Under ACTIONS (bottom image, right side of screen), you can download a syllabus, print it or open it to peruse.
The One Question/One Answer Form (or “1Q/1A”)

Department/Program Name: ____________________________

1. Program Learning Outcome (Goal): ____________________________

Instructions: Think of your program’s learning outcomes (POs). Choose any one program outcome to be assessed. This might be an outcome in an area of your program that faculty find particularly challenging for students. Write the selected program outcome in the space provided above. This will be your program’s “One Question” for this assessment exercise. If the outcome is very broad or comprehensive, it may be too complex to assess. In this case, consider breaking the outcome into parts and assessing one “smaller” outcome.

As an example from the Liberal Arts, consider the following learning outcome for a French program:

Upon completion of the major, the student will be able to discern themes of literary passages in French and understand complex vocabulary and idiomatic expressions.

The following is an outcome that is more measurable or “assessable”: Upon completion of the major, the student will be able to understand idiomatic expressions.

2. Align the Program Outcome (PO) with a DSLP:

Instructions: Consider the program outcome (learning goal) you have selected and listed in #1 above from your program. Now review the list of Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) on the accompanying handout and select the one that aligns most clearly with the PO.

Using the prior example: The ability of a student to understand and use idiomatic expressions is most closely aligned with the DSLP called “Information Literacy.”

---

1 Program outcomes represent the skills, competencies and professional attitudes we expect our students to have achieved by the time of their graduation.
3. One Question:

Instructions: Consider the program outcome (learning goal) you have selected and listed in #1 above from your program. Formulate a question that describes what the faculty would like to know. Often times, the question selected is a course-embedded student learning outcome (SLO) found in a course syllabus.

Using the prior example: Can our students recognize, understand and use common Francophone idiomatic expressions?

4. One Answer (among many potential answers):

Data:

Instructions: Devise a way to determine the answer to your question. This may be a quiz, oral or written test, team project, capstone experience, or some other student assessment that gives faculty information to answer the question. The “answer” should include supporting data.

Using the prior example: Our faculty collaborated to construct an hour-long exam consisting of passages containing French idioms that students completing the program should know. Students were instructed to identify and translate common Francophone idiomatic expressions. The test was administered to all seniors in their last semester of the program.

Data: Student exam results entered into Excel along with a graph showing the outcomes.

5. Set a Performance Criteria for Success

Instructions: Here you will state what you need to know to determine if students have achieved this specific program outcome/learning goal. Ask: “What criteria can be used to gauge whether this program outcome has been achieved?” The answer stems from applying the following best practices assessment standard: Eighty percent of
Our students will score an 80 percent or higher on points that measure the achievement of this Program Outcome. This "points standard" is generally for graduate programs. For undergraduate programs, depending on the desired level of rigor, programs use a "75 percent or higher" points standard across all course- and program-level assessments.

Using the prior example for an undergraduate program: Eighty percent of our students will score a 75 percent or higher on points that measure Francophone idiomatic expressions.

6. What are the Potential Implications of the Results? How will your program use the results – Good, Bad or Ugly?

Instructions: Briefly discuss the range of potential/hypothetical results (from your analysis) in the context of the program outcome/learning goal assessed. If only 50 percent achieve the desired program outcome, what do these results mean to this specific learning goal? If 80 percent do achieve the desired outcome, how confident are you that your program is producing graduates who meet the defined learning goal? Questions to ponder: Will you change anything because of what you’ve learned? If so, what, how and when? What do you expect to happen as a result of that change? Will you change course content? Course sequence? Pedagogy? Will you develop new questions that will provide additional or more applicable information?

Write a synopsis of your plan of action (perhaps 2-3 bullets) in the space above, should the outcome fall below the desired threshold to meet this program learning outcome.

Using the prior example:

- Meet with program faculty in the following term to discuss the outcomes, generate potential solutions, and develop a plan of action
- Revisit courses that teach Francophone idiomatic expressions to encourage greater visibility of the content and greater emphasis on its future importance, including its role in the senior year
- Re-emphasize in senior year courses the role of the Francophone idiomatic expressions exam and offer preliminary/trial exams to seniors
- Re-evaluate the structure of the Francophone idiomatic expressions exam to ensure reliability and clarity. Check to determine if a standardized exam in this content area is available and merits use in lieu of the existing exam

Please contact Dr. A.S. Ziner with any questions at drew.ziner@drexel.edu or x3916.
The Course-Level Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome (PO) Number, Description and Aligned DSLPs</th>
<th>Course-Embedded Student Learning Objective (SLO) Metric (Direct &amp; Indirect Measures Aligned with the PO)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin College of Professional Studies</td>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-Level Assessment Report</td>
<td>Measuring the Attainment of Key DSLPs and Program Outcomes through their Alignment with SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: Construction Management (CMGT)</td>
<td>Instructor: Robert Muir, PhD, PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number &amp; Section: CMGT 467 Sections 001 and 601</td>
<td>Term &amp; Year: AV 2012-13 (Fall, Winter, &amp; Spring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which Program Outcomes are Assessed This Term? (PO #1 and 1)</td>
<td>Date Report Submitted to PD: 7/3/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome #1:</td>
<td>PO Description: Demonstrate knowledge of relevant subject matter described in the American Council for Construction Education (ACCE) guidelines Aligned DSLPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMGT 467 Direct:</td>
<td>80% of students will score a 75 or higher on Quiz Q1</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>15 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Met Goal # Met Goal # Met Goal</td>
<td>10 (77%) 9 (62%)</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>9 (62%)</td>
<td>9 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: In Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, &gt;80% students met goal; in Winter 2013, &lt;80% met goal. The means of the respective terms: F12 88, 16.6, W13 87, 20.9, S13 85, 15.8</td>
<td>Action Plans Recommendations for Change in Course Assessment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans:</td>
<td>The outcome for W13 falls slightly below the goal. However, the means score of 87 were highest for that term. Instructor will reinforce lessons learned in A1 &amp; A2 which should be reflected in Q1 outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mean Class Mean Class Mean</td>
<td>The growth in competency was significant for this PO/SLO. The increase reported in the Fall 2012 went from 2.7 (p=0.58) to 4.6 (p=0.08) and in the Spring 2013 from 2.0 (p=0.71) to 5.0 (p=0.0). No report for Winter 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Features:

- Program outcome is aligned with DSLPs
- Direct and indirect evidence is stated along with associated metrics
- Summative outcomes for each form of assessment evidence are presented over three terms
- Trend analysis is provided for each form of evidence
- Action plans are specified, including the need to “close the loop” in the winter 2013
EXERCISE: INTERPRETING ASSESSMENT DATA TO “CLOSE THE LOOP”

The Program Director and Manager should use this assessment exercise, along with instructors who participate in course-level program assessment. The exercise is designed to encourage decisive conversations about the program’s assessment data. This example is for one outcome, such as that provided through the 1Q/1A, but can be used for any and all outcomes.

Step 1: Review the outcome and if appropriate, review the standard, performance criteria, or metric for the outcome. What level of achievement is to be attained by those who are measured by the outcome? Review previous assessment cycle’s evidence, findings, and recommended changes. What changes were made, when?

Step 2: Only analyze the data that relates to the outcome. Assemble (collect) all of the evidence that relates to that outcome. Determine the quantity of data that is best reflective of your program. For example, if the response rate on a survey is less than 25 percent, should this data be considered? (Most likely this response rate is not reflective of the entire group of students, so should not be used.) If samples were used, ensure that there were enough samples to make appropriate interpretations. If the entire class was used, ensure that there is adequate representation (usually two-thirds or greater).

Step 3: Interpret and summarize the data. Below are some questions to consider.

- Does the students’ performance show that they meet your metric for this outcome?
- Does the percentage of the data increase or decrease over time? (Typically, an increase or decrease of more than 3–5% is considered “change”)
- How does this evidence compare to all programs at your institution, if available? (Typically, more than 5–8% difference is considered “different”)
- How do the modifications or changes to the program or curriculum since the last assessment cycle impact the interpretation of this data?
- Is part or all of the outcome met? Is one dimension of the outcome an area of strength or concern?
- Is there a positive or negative trend over the past few years?
- Does one assessment method provide better quality data? How would you compare the results from the senior design course with assessment within a junior-level course?
Are there areas where their performance is adequate but where you would like to see a higher level of performance?

**Step 4:** This is the “closing the loop” part of the exercise. Here, modifications that the program needs to make are recommended based on the findings from step 3. The following types of modifications (patterns of closing the loop) can be recommended:

- Modify learning outcome
- Modify assessment method
- Change performance metric
- Change order of material within a course
- Change order of courses or adding more courses into curriculum
- Increase the number of lab sessions or problem sessions within a course
- Conduct more in-depth assessment of the cause of the issue during the next academic year
- Modifying content within a course
- Modify pedagogy for that course or material

**Step 5:** Document the summary of the evidence and the recommendations and discuss with entire program faculty.

**Step 6:** Document the final decisions about the findings and modifications the program wants to make. Be sure to note any procedures that need to be followed for this modification to take place. For example, to add or modify a course, approval may be needed from the university's curriculum committee and others. Ensure that procedures are followed.

**Step 7:** Next assessment cycle, review above results, follow modifications, if any, and consider new data.
### Vision:

The Construction Management program at Drexel University is committed to being the preeminent center for the advancement and dissemination of construction management knowledge.

### Mission:

The Drexel University Construction Management program is dedicated to raising the levels of professionalism, integrity, ethical practice, and performance within the construction industry.

### Undergraduate Program Outcomes:

Graduates with a Bachelor of Science in Construction Management degree from Drexel University will be able to:

- Demonstrate knowledge of relevant subject matter described in the ACCE guidelines.
- Demonstrate leadership qualities through experiential learning.
- Apply various techniques and methods to efficiently and effectively plan and control construction projects.
- Understand the value of and apply sustainable building practices to optimize use of available resources.
## Program Educational Objectives:

The Construction Management program will:

1. Sustain an active and engaged industry advisory board.
2. Maintain a motivated and qualified faculty.
3. Endeavor to maintain appropriate equipment for instructional purposes.
4. Produce graduates with significant construction industry field experience.
5. Produce graduates who will be able to integrate ethical decision-making into the construction industry.
6. Foster a dedicated alumni group from satisfied graduates to mentor and enrich our students.
5. Mapping Student Learning Outcomes to Program Outcomes (Q5)

### B.S. in Construction Management (CMGT 240, CMGT 251, CMGT 451, and CMGT 467 only)

**Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) Mapped to Program Outcomes**

**Program Outcomes Mapped to Dreux Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSLPs Mapped to Each Program Outcome</th>
<th>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12</th>
<th>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</th>
<th>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome:</td>
<td>1. Demonstrate knowledge of relevant subject matter described in the American Council for Construction Education (ACCPE) guidelines</td>
<td>2. Demonstrate leadership qualities through experiential learning</td>
<td>3. Apply various techniques and methods to efficiently and effectively plan and control construction projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-Embedded Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Presented in the Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CMGT 240 - Economic Planning for Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO-1: Construct and analyze a cash flow diagram for capital projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-2: Compute present worth, future worth, and equivalent annual worth manually using functional notation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-3: Use electronic spreadsheets for economic analysis including rate of return</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-4: Perform break-even analysis and benefit/cost ratios to analyze capital projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-5: Construct decision trees to model decisions and their possible consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-6: Conduct sensitivity analysis to test the effects of variation or uncertainty in decisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-7: Make construction decisions founded on ethical principles and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-8: Write professional reports describing economic decisions related to construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CMGT 251 - Construction Surveying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO-1: Determine elevations of existing features and set elevations for future construction on a project site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3. In Construction Management (CMGT 240, CMGT 251, CMGT 451, and CMGT 467 only)

#### Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) Mapped to Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course-Etmed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Presented in the Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-2: Measure angles and distances, mathematically close and adjust, and compute coordinates for points in a horizontal control traverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-3: Locate and compute north and east coordinates for existing and proposed features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-4: Layout proposed construction elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMGT 451 - Heavy Construction Principles &amp; Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-1: Know and understand basic soil behavior during construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-2: Be able to select the proper equipment to perform various earthwork operations based on function, range, capacity, and other variables</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-3: Compute simple earthwork quantities based on cross sections or contours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-4: Produce and use earthwork mass haul diagrams to manage cut and fill operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-5: Select the proper crane size, capacity, related lifting equipment, and location for various building and heavy construction operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-6: Recognize and correct unsafe equipment operation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-7: Use electronic spreadsheets and other software to manage construction operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status of Program Assessment Report - CMGT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course-Evaluated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Presented in the Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO-8: Identify various bridge components and understand the required means, methods, and sequences of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-9: Understand the techniques and complexity associated with aerial and underground utility installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-10: Organize and manage a building or residential site development operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Program Outcomes Mapped to Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMGT 467 - Techniques of Project Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO-1: Manually perform forward and backward pass calculations to compute early and late starts and finishes, float, overall project duration, and identify the critical path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-2: Manually plot and manipulate ADM and PDM networks and employ Excel to produce bar charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-3: Manually prepare a WBS, OBS, and RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-4: Prepare a schedule for a small (&lt;100 activities) construction project using Primavera P6 including application of calendars, activity coding, and resource assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-5: Complete a schedule update by status progress, modifying logic, and other required modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-6: Prepare a short interval schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding the values of and apply sustainable building practices to optimize use of available resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes:</th>
<th>DSLPs Mapped to Each Program Outcome</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Embedded Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Presented in the Syllabus</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO-7: Manage construction projects through structured planning and scheduling including coordination with subcontractors, suppliers, and fabricators</td>
<td>SLO-8: Identify scheduling pitfalls and recognize the limitations of the various scheduling methodologies</td>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of relevant subject matter described in the American Council for Construction Education (ACE) guidelines</td>
<td>Demonstrate leadership qualities through experiential learning</td>
<td>Apply various techniques and methods to efficiently and effectively plan and control construction projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.S. in Construction Management

CMGT Program Outcomes (POs) Mapped to Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)</th>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ an understanding of audience, purpose and context to communicate effectively in a range of situations using appropriate media</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE AND CRITICAL THINKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use divergent (e.g., generation of novel ideas, thinking out of the box, brainstorming) and convergent thinking (e.g., critical thinking, evaluation of ideas, quantitative and qualitative analysis, scientific reasoning) to generate novel and relevant ideas, strategies, approaches, or products</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICAL REASONING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess their own ethical values and the social context of ethical problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to an ethical problem, and consider the consequences of alternative actions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION LITERACY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess the skills and knowledge to access, evaluate, and use information effectively, competently, and creatively</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)</td>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish goals and monitor progress</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward them by developing an awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the personal, environmental, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task-specific factors that affect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attainment of the goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY USE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make appropriate use of technologies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to communicate, collaborate, solve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems, make decisions, and conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research, as well as foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity and life-long learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL COMPETENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in, reflect upon, and</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate open mindedness toward all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues of diversity at the local,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national, and international level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a vision, translate that vision</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into shared goals, and effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work with others to achieve these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge and skills gained from</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a program of study to the achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of goals in a work, clinical, or other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)</td>
<td>Program Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of relevant subject matter described in the American Council for Construction Education (ACCE) guidelines</td>
<td>Demonstrate leadership qualities through experiential learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Document POs and DSLPs (Q7a)

No Program Level Outcomes are Present in the Student Co-Op Survey.
7. Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Inform Decisions about Student Learning (Q7b)
Employer Evaluation of CMGT Co-Op Student Work Ethic, Fall 2012 (n=25)

- Attendance (A1) 4.6
- Punctuality (A2) 4.52
- Initiative (A3) 4.2
- Leadership (A4) 3.64
- Time Management (A5) 3.88
- Dependability (A6) 4.24
- Interaction with others (A7) 4.24
- Teamwork (A8) 4.32
- Productivity (work completed) (A9) 3.56
- Attitude appropriate for work environment (A10) 4.24

Mean Ratings (1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent)
Employer Evaluation of Co-Op Experience by DSLP Category, Fall 2012 (n=25)

- Communicate effectively through writing (R1): 3.72
- Demonstrate effective verbal communication (R2): 3.92
- Communicate appropriately with different audiences (R3): 3.92
- Provide feedback about assigned projects and tasks (R4): 3.88
- Contribute original and relevant ideas, etc. (R5): 4.04
- Critically analyze and solve complex problems (R6): 4.04
- Uphold ethical standards in the workplace (R7): 4.28
- Make well-reasoned, data-supported decisions (R8): 4
- Use information effectively to accomplish a task (R9): 4.04
- Set goals and monitor progress (R10): 3.68
- Use appropriate technologies to complete assigned tasks (R11): 4.24
- Work effectively with people with diverse beliefs, etc. (R12): 4.4
- Build professional relationships (R13): 4.08
- Improve skills important to success in a field/industry (R14): 4.24
- Effectively integrate into the workplace culture, etc. (R15): 4.04

Mean Ratings (1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Excellent)
7. Using Employer and Student Co-Op Surveys to Improve the Surveys (Q7c) | Description of Evidence

No program-level outcomes are present in the student co-op survey. As a result, the Director of the CMGT Program should contact the SCDC to update the student co-op survey with current program outcomes.
8. Assessing Program Outcomes Using Direct and/or Indirect Assessment Methods (Q8)

Presentation of Evidence

Example of Direct and Indirect Evidence Used in Assessing Program Outcomes

- Six SLOs are aligned with two Program Outcomes for assessment purposes in this course
- Five of the six SLOs involve direct evidence (three discussion boards @50 points each and two assignments (papers) @250 points each)
- One of the SLOs involves indirect evidence (reflective essay covering course material @250 points)
- Assessment data is obtained through normal grade entries in BbLearn
- We use the following assessment standard to determine if students achieve the SLO: Eighty percent of the students must score 80 percent or higher on points that measure the achievement of the specific student learning outcome (e.g., 80 percent of a 50 point discussion board assignment equals 40 points)
- Using the 80 percent threshold, review of course data indicates that none of the course averages across the six types of evidence (three discussion boards and three assignments) fell below the 80 percent threshold; no “closing the loop” is necessary
- Results show that each of the six assessment outcomes exceed the points that measure the achievement of the respective SLO
- These assessment outcomes support the SLO/PO alignments in this course
This document represents your first assessment report. A .pdf copy is provided for your convenience. However, as your program addresses action items contained in this report that are associated with the process of course-level student assessment and AEFIS training in Levels 3 and 4, an essential goal in the 2013-2014 AY is to introduce course assessment data into AEFIS and, in turn, generate an annual report consistent with your programmatic needs and those specified by the ACCE.
10. Role of Assessment Outcomes in the Program (Q10)

Here are examples of the way our program has used assessment results to inform decisions about one or more aspects of the program:

- CMGT 361 & 362 Contracts and Specifications I & II to address responsive bidding practices
- CMGT 451 Heavy Construction Principles & Practices to address proper crane sizing, placement, and selection, bridge erection procedures, earthwork computation, and heavy equipment production rates
- CMGT 450 Construction Management of Field Operations addressing site logistics, especially access issues
- CMGT 364 Estimating II addresses markups such as general overhead, contingency, and profit
- CMGT 467 Techniques of Project Control to included great emphasis on determining and articulating means and methods

Incorporating the ASC Competition to Close the Learning Loop

In 2009, the Drexel University Construction Management (CMGT) Program began participating full time in the Associated Schools of Construction (ASC) Region 1 Competition. Since that time, Drexel has entered four student teams in the Heavy Construction category. As a consequence of efforts among our faculty to “close the loop” (to be described), each team has placed higher than their predecessors in this important and visible competition. In our first year, the Drexel team placed eighth out of the nine teams. The following year, in 2010, the Drexel team made a significant leap to third place among the ten teams. In 2011, the team’s raw score ranked them, again, in third place. However, the team was penalized 25 points for late submittal of their proposal and finished in fifth place out of ten. In 2012, our student team earned a second place honor out of the ten teams. These incremental improvements are encouraging indicators that our efforts to address curricular shortcomings are both beneficial and consequential. Each change came about as a result of efforts to reflect on, and implement needed changes in, construction management curriculum.

The Process in Place

Since 2009, after each competition, each team “debriefed” and performed a rigorous post-competition assessment. This process involves each team member preparing a “Lessons Learned” document (available on request) that addresses the subject matter included in the project as well as issues related to the competition such as preparation, team dynamics, and game day strategy. The team collectively develops a list of pluses and deltas. These documents, along with the team’s proposal and presentation, are
then shared with the successor teams and serve as excellent teaching tools. Moreover, both sets of documents are shared with the CMGT faculty to confirm strengths and identify gaps or weaknesses. Where relevant, faculty members fine-tune identified content of the associated course(s). Examples of courses and course content that have been strengthened as a result of this process include:

- CMGT 361 & 362 Contracts and Specifications I & II to address responsive bidding practices
- CMGT 451 Heavy Construction Principles & Practices to address proper crane sizing, placement, and selection, bridge erection procedures, earthwork computation, and heavy equipment production rates
- CMGT 450 Construction Management of Field Operations addressing site logistics, especially access issues
- CMGT 364 Estimating II addresses markups such as general overhead, contingency, and profit
- CMGT 467 Techniques of Project Control to included great emphasis on determining and articulating means and methods

Here are ways our program has involved our faculty in the assessment process for this degree program:

- Partially through regular discussions in faculty meetings
- Committee level work
- Alumni Surveys (status of program)
- CMAC Curriculum Committee

Program Director is currently working on using direct measure to assess performance in terms of SLOs, PO, and DSLPs. Once complete and in alignment with the Director of Assessment’s, the Program Director will guide other full-time faculty through the process. Full implementation is expected in AY 2013-14
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Goodwin College SoTAPS Assessment Survey August 2011

Goodwin College Outcomes Assessment Survey - Due by August 11, 2011

Dear Program Directors and Managers:

I need the following assessment information from you for each of your programs (undergraduate and graduate) by no later than Thursday, August 11, 2011. Please complete this online survey and send ALL requested information (documents) to Dr. Ziner, Goodwin College’s Assessment Manager, at Drew.Ziner@Drexel.edu ASAP. If this information is not presently available, when asked, please provide a date when we can anticipate it.

If you have any questions about ANY of the requested documentation, please contact Dr. Ziner immediately at x3916 or send him an email.

In advance, thank you for completing this brief survey.

Dr. Abi Aghayere
Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
School of Technology and Professional Studies
Goodwin College of Professional Studies
Drexel University

1. To which of the following schools in Drexel University’s Goodwin College are you employed?
   - School of Technology and Professional Studies
   - School of Education

2. Are you the director of at least one program in your school?
   - No
   - Yes
   If “yes,” please enter the name of each program to which you are the director.
   
3. Are you the manager of at least one program in your school?
   - No
   - Yes
   If “yes,” please enter the name of each program to which you are the manager.
   

Throughout this short survey, questions will be asked about your assessment activities in relation to your program(s). While most require a simple “yes” or “no” response (e.g., “Do all of your course syllabi for each of your programs contain statements of expected student learning outcomes?”), for either response, it may not be that simple. You may be in need of some assistance. To effectively respond to your potential need across all assessment activities, please complete the following survey items.

### 4. How would you rate your level of need for assistance in each of the following assessment activity areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing student learning outcomes.</th>
<th>Great deal of assistance is needed</th>
<th>Moderate amount of assistance is needed</th>
<th>Small amount of assistance is needed</th>
<th>No assistance is needed</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed student learning assessment plans (e.g., scheduling and “closing the loop”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed program outcomes (POs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed program educational objectives (PEOs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping student learning outcomes (and related educational experiences) to program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping program learning outcomes to Drexel student learning priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of DSLPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing at least one program outcome using a DIRECT measure (e.g., course exams, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing at least one program outcome using an INDIRECT measure (e.g., surveys tied to the student, employer, and alumni and industry advisory board).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining which direct and indirect (i.e., multiple) measures best assess program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing your annual assessment report (which includes findings for the academic year and steps taken/planned by you and your faculty to correct any deficiencies).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions on how to involve your faculty in the outcomes assessment activities for your program(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Do ALL of your course syllabi for each of your programs contain statements of expected student learning outcomes?
   - Yes.
   - No. Here is the date I plan to meet this important requirement:

Your Program Level Assessment Plan(s)

6. Do ALL of your degree programs have a student learning assessment plan indicating the schedule for assessment of your program outcomes and the process by which you intend to "close the loop" and engage your faculty in the assessment process?
   - Yes.
   - No, but I expect to submit the assessment plans to the Goodwin College Assessment Manager by the following date:

7. You indicated that ALL of your degree programs have a student learning assessment plan with schedules of assessment. Would you please send a copy of the plan(s) to Goodwin College’s Assessment Manager?
   - Yes, I’ll send this information ASAP.

Your Program Level Assessment Plans

8. Do each of your programs have one or more explicit program outcomes (POs)?
   - Yes, and I will send the program outcomes for each of my programs to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but I expect to have my program outcomes ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by the following date:

   NOTE: Program outcomes (POs) represent what your students are expected to be able to do at graduation from your program (e.g., skills and competencies).

9. Do each of your programs have one or more explicit program educational objectives (PEOs)?
   - Yes, and I will send the program educational objectives for each of my programs to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but I expect to have my program educational objectives ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by the following date:

   Program educational objectives (PEOs) represent what your students are expected to be able to do three to five years after they graduate.

10. Have your student learning outcomes in your courses and other educational experiences (e.g., Co-op) been mapped to your program outcomes?
    - Yes, and I will send the curricular/educational experience mapping to Dr. Ziner.
    - No, but I expect to have this curricular/educational experience mapping ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by this date:

11. Have your Program Learning Outcomes been mapped to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One?
    - Yes, and I will send my program outcomes-to-DSLPs mapping ASAP.
    - No, but I expect to have this program outcomes-to-DSLPs and mappings ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by this date:

    Note: Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) can be found by logging into one.drexel.edu, clicking on the EMPLOYEES tab, and downloading the third item (a .pdf file titled “Drexel Student Learning Priorities”) listed under “Academic Information and Reports.”

12. Do your program(s) involve a Co-op experience for students?
    - Yes.
    - No.
### Status of Program Assessment Report - CMGT

**For programs with Co-ops ONLY**

13. Have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of your program outcomes and the DSLPs?
   - Yes, and I will send my findings from the last cycle of Co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but I expect to have my analysis of the Co-op survey ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by this date: ____________

14. Have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program?
   - Yes, and I will send my findings from the last cycle of Co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but I expect to have my analysis of the Co-op survey ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by this date: ____________

15. Have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?
   - Yes, and I will send my findings from the last cycle of Co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but I expect to have my analysis of the Co-op survey ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by this date: ____________

16. Have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using a DIRECT assessment method (e.g., course assessments, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams)?
   - Yes.
   - No.

17. Have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using an INDIRECT assessment method (e.g., student, employer, and alumni and industry advisory board surveys)?
   - Yes.
   - No.

18. If you currently measure at least one of your program outcomes using multiple (i.e., direct and indirect) assessment methods, would you please send a copy of your report to Dr. Ziner?
   - Yes, I'll send it ASAP.
   - No, because I have not yet reached this level of program assessment.

   *If "no," but it is almost ready, please provide a date so we can anticipate your data and assessment report.*

19. Have you communicated these important assessment outcomes to the faculty in your program(s)?
   - Yes.
   - No.

20. Have you used the results to inform decisions about the program(s) you assessed?
   - Yes.
   - No.

21. Do you currently have an annual assessment report indicating your assessment findings for the academic year and what steps you and your faculty plan to take to correct any deficiencies (i.e., "close the loop")?
   - Yes, and I will send the report to Dr. Ziner ASAP.
   - No, but my first annual assessment report will be ready for submission to Dr. Ziner by the following date: ____________
22. Are your program faculty involved in the outcomes assessment activities for your program?

- Yes
- No

If you checked "no," please indicate how you PLAN to involve your faculty in the assessment process.

23. Please indicate how you have involved your faculty in the assessment process.

Goodwin College Outcomes Assessment Survey - Due by August 11, 2011

Thank you so much for your time and cooperation in taking this survey! Please be sure to send all of the requested documents to Dr. Ziner, Goodwin College's Assessment Manager, at Drew.Ziner@Drexel.edu.

If you have any questions about ANY of the requested documentation, please contact Dr. Ziner immediately at (215) 571-3916 or send him an email.

Have a GREAT DAY!
Appendix B
Program Assessment Review (PAR) Survey, Spring 2012

DREXEL UNIVERSITY
GOODWIN COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
PROGRAM-LEVEL ASSESSMENT REVIEW FORM (v1)
(Completed for Each Degree-Bearing Program You Currently Direct)

School: Technology and Professional Studies
Program Area/Unit: 
Degree(s) Offered: B.S. M.S. Ph.D. (circle one)
Concentrations: 
Program (if different from above) 
Year Program was Implemented: 
Date of Last Review: N/A in 2011/2012
Date of Current Review: 

Composition of Degree Program's Assessment Review Team
Sr. Associate Dean: Abi Aghayere, Ph.D.
Program Director:
Program Manager:
Assessment Manager: Andrew Scott Ziner, Ph.D.

I. Statement of your academic program's mission:

II. Summative Program Data – Please insert the requested data related to the program in the blank rows. If no data are available for a given year, write "NA" (Not Available) in cell. Please provide data for the current year (estimates, if appropriate) plus the last three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Annualized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Serving the Program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Budget/Costs (personnel, operating, equipment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Annualized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Progress Since Last Program-Level Assessment Review (Not Applicable in 2011-2012)
This section is a status report of the actions taken from the last review, if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Steps Taken/Progress Reported</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Continuous Assessment Activities (formative program evaluation)
This section presents program-level assessment activities performed – or that need to be performed – by a program’s director, manager and their faculty. For each assessment activity, please (a) indicate whether or not the specific activity has been performed for your degree-bearing program, (b) if supportive documentation on the specific assessment activity (e.g., a “completed assessment plan”) was sent to the Assessment Manager for review, and (c) rate your level of need for assistance to effectively accomplish this important activity. Note: Even if the assessment activity was performed, you may still perceive the need for guidance and help to review the work or activity already completed. Please use the following “Level of Need for Assistance” scale of 1 - 4:

Four-Point Rating Scale:
1. Great Deal of Assistance is Needed
2. Moderate Amount of Assistance is Needed
3. Small Amount of Assistance is Needed
4. No Assistance is Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activity Area for Degree-Bearing Program (Numbered 1-14 in the Baseline Report)</th>
<th>a) Was the Activity Performed? (Y/N)</th>
<th>b) Was Documentation Provided? (Y/N)</th>
<th>c) Self-rated Level of Need for Assistance Score (1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do all course syllabi for this program contain statements of expected student learning outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does this degree program have a student learning assessment plan indicating the schedule for assessing your program outcomes and the process by which you intend to ‘close the loop’ and engage your faculty in the assessment process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does this degree program have one or more explicit program outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does this degree program have one or more explicit program educational objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. For this degree program, have the student learning outcomes in your courses and other educational experiences (e.g., Co-ops) been mapped to your program outcomes?

6. For this degree program, have your Program Learning Outcomes been mapped to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One?

7. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of your program outcomes and the DSLPs?

8. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program?

9. CO-OP PROGRAMS ONLY: For this degree program, have you used the employer and student Co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?

10. For this degree program, have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using a DIRECT assessment method (e.g., course assessments, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams)?

11. For this degree program, have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using an INDIRECT assessment method (e.g., student, employer, alumni and industry advisory board surveys)?

12. For this degree program, have you communicated assessment outcomes to program faculty?

13. For this degree program, do you currently have an annual assessment report indicating your assessment findings for the academic year and what steps you and your faculty plan to take to correct any deficiencies (i.e., ‘close the loop’)?

14. Are faculty involved in the outcomes assessment activities for this degree program? Please provide 2-3 examples on the back of this page

V. **Program Strengths (Bulleted Items; Completed by Assessment Manager, Reflects Outcomes in Parts II & IV)**
VI. Areas of Assessment in Need of Improvement (Bulleted items; Completed by Assessment Manager, Reflects only Part IV Outcomes)

VII. Action Plan (Based on Sections IV and VI; Completed by Assessment Manager)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Sought</th>
<th>Action Plan (Steps to be Taken)</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Please provide a statement of the means by which your program realizes its mission, as provided in Section I (page 1) of this Program Assessment Review Form.

IX. Comments [Bulleted items: Were the Goals Established in Goodwin College’s Baseline Report met for this Academic Program? Why or why not? Completed by the Assessment Manager.]
Date: October 23, 2012

To: Program Directors
    Goodwin College of Professional Studies

Re: Questions to be addressed in Goodwin College’s Annual Assessment Report

cc: Abi Aghayere, Ph.D., P. Eng.
    Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
    Goodwin College of Professional Studies
    Drexel University

As I assemble the College's annual assessment report, important pieces of information to include are your perceptions and experience with your program’s assessment efforts to-date. Please respond to each of the questions on the following page as soon as possible. Simply edit this document directly and provide your response below each question. When you’re done, please email this entire document to me at drew.ziner@drexel.edu.

If you have any questions about this brief survey, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

In advance, thank you for your time and cooperation.

Andrew Scott Ziner, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment
Goodwin College of Professional Studies
One Drexel Plaza
3001 Market Street, Suite 100
Philadelphia, PA 19104
### 1. Is continuous assessment important in your program? Please list 1-2 reasons why you believe it is or is not important in your program.

**Response:**

### 2. How well prepared is your program to begin (or continue) assessing one or more of its program outcomes?

**Response:**

### 3. Please list 1-2 strengths that characterize your program's assessment efforts at this time.

**Response:**

### 4. Please list 1-2 weaknesses that characterize your program's assessment efforts at this time.

**Response:**

### 5. Please describe 1-2 of the biggest challenges you believe your program faces in documenting and measuring student learning. You are welcome to provide more than two challenges, if you desire.

**Response:**

### 6. Please list 1-2 areas of improvement you believe are needed to advance your program's continuous assessment efforts. You are welcome to provide more than two areas of improvement, if you desire.

**Response:**

---

Thank you for taking the time to complete this important survey!
Appendix D

Status of Program Assessment (SPA) Survey at Goodwin College, 2012-2013

Welcome! As the Program Director or Manager of your degree-bearing program at the Goodwin College of Professional Studies, please help me to complete this brief Status of Program Assessment (SPA) survey as a follow-up to the baseline Goodwin College Assessment Study undertaken by your program in the 2011-2012 academic year. A separate survey will need to be completed for each program at the B.S. and M.S. levels (if appropriate).

The purpose of this focused self-study is to obtain current program-specific data to document and measure the strengths and weaknesses of each program’s assessment activities and address any program-related assessment challenges that lie ahead in your continuous assessment efforts. We will use the outcomes from this SPA survey to help plan for your future program assessment efforts. Moreover, where relevant and appropriate, current data will be compared to parallel baseline data obtained from your program in the 2011-2012 academic year to document strides made in continuous improvement. Finally, in areas in which evidence is provided (e.g., your program’s mission statement), I will be using the PAR rubric we reviewed during our SoTAPS faculty and staff meeting on April 22. Consequently, you can use information contained in the resulting report to help develop your upcoming PAR self-study led by the PAR Committee and the Provost’s Office.

After you complete this brief survey, I will create a newsletter-style document (to be uploaded to Data Points) that captures your program’s assessment energies to-date, including summative and formative data on fifteen assessment activities previously presented in SoTAPS’ baseline report. Also part of this document will be a program-level action plan that you can use to forge ahead with your continuous assessment energies in the fall and beyond.

Together, we want to put our best energy and effort forward to address any and all issues to be identified in the resulting report on the Status of Program Assessment at Goodwin College. With a dual focus on the quality of our programs and student learning outcomes, this formative and summative investigation is designed to help us determine — and respond to — how well our continuous assessment efforts are faring at the program, school and college levels.
If you have any questions about this study, please contact me directly at extension 3916 or drew.ziner@drexel.edu.

**School of Technology and Professional Studies SPA Survey**

1. Please circle the program in your school about which you will now provide requested information.  *Select only one. Please complete a separate Status of Program Assessment (SPA) survey for each program at the B.S. and M.S. levels (if appropriate).*

- Engineering Technology, B.S.
- Engineering Technology, M.S.
- Computing and Security Technology, B.S.
- Construction Management, B.S.
- Construction Management, M.S.
- HOSP - Hospitality Management, B.S.
- HOSP - Hospitality Management, M.S.
- HOSP - Food Science, M.S.
- HOSP - Culinary Arts, B.S.
- HOSP - Culinary Science, B.S.
- MEP - Creativity and Innovation, M.S.
- MEP - Professional Studies, B.S.
- MEP - Professional Studies, M.S.
- MEP - Project Management, M.S.
- MEP - Property Management, B.S.
- MEP - Property Management, M.S.
- MEP - Communications and Applied Technology, B.S.
- MEP - General Studies, B.S.
- Sport Management, B.S.
- Sport Management, M.S.
School of Technology and Professional Studies SPA Survey - Mission

2. Does this degree program have a mission statement? If so, please enter your program’s mission statement in the text box below. Note: A discussion of a program’s mission statement is found at Data Points.

| No, I have not started to develop a mission statement at this time. |
| No, but I have been working on developing this statement with program stakeholders. |
| Yes, here is the current mission statement: |

School of Technology and Professional Studies SPA Survey - Summative Data

3. This SPA survey item requests summative program data for the current 2012-2013 academic year. Please provide data for the following areas in the text box below:

| 3.1 Student Enrollment |
| 3.2 Number of FT Faculty |
| 3.3 Number of PT/Adjunct Faculty |
| 3.4 Number of Program Graduates |
This section of the SPA survey centers on your need for assistance performing fourteen (14) assessment activities associated with this degree program. While the accomplishment of most activities requires a simple "yes" or "no" response (e.g., "Do all course syllabi for this program contain statements of expected student learning outcomes?"), a "yes" or "no" response may not be that simple. As Program Director, you may need some assistance clarifying an activity's role or the process involved. In this section, you will be asked to rate your level of need for assistance in each assessment activity area.

1. How would you rate your level of need for assistance in each of the following assessment activity areas? Please place an “X” in the cell that best corresponds to your level of need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Great deal of assistance is needed</th>
<th>Moderate amount of assistance is needed</th>
<th>Small amount of assistance is needed</th>
<th>No assistance is needed</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Developing your program's mission statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Developing student learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Developing your program's assessment plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Developing program outcomes (POs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Mapping student learning outcomes (and related educational experiences) to program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Mapping program learning outcomes to Drexel student learning priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to document student achievement of DSLPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great deal of assistance is needed</td>
<td>Moderate amount of assistance needed</td>
<td>Small amount of assistance is needed</td>
<td>No assistance is needed</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Using the employer/student Co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Assessing at least one program outcome using a DIRECT measure (e.g., course exams, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Assessing at least one program outcome using an INDIRECT measure (e.g., surveys tied to the student, employer, and alumni and industry advisory board).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Determining which direct and indirect (i.e., multiple) measures best assess program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Developing your annual assessment report (which includes findings for the academic year and steps taken/planned by you and your faculty to correct any deficiencies).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Suggestions on how to involve your faculty in the outcomes assessment activities for your program(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School of Technology and Professional Studies SPA Survey – Activities Performed

5. What percentage of all course syllabi for this program contains statements of expected learning objectives (i.e., student learning outcomes)? This information can be obtained through AEFIS, where all program syllabi are housed. Contact Dr. Ziner or Marisa Low for assistance, if necessary.

| 100 percent of all course syllabi for my program contain SLOs. |
| ___ percent of all course syllabi for my program contain SLOs. As this is a work in progress, here is a time frame for completion: ________________ |

6. Does this degree program have one or more explicit program outcomes (POs)? Program outcomes represent what students from your program are expected to be able to do at graduation (e.g., skills, competencies and professional attitudes).

| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ________________ |
| Yes, and here are all of my program’s outcomes statements: |

7. For this degree program, have the student learning objectives (i.e., SLOs) in your courses and other educational experiences (e.g., Co-op) been mapped to your program outcomes?

| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ________________ |
| Yes, and here is the mapping of SLOs to POs in my program (If inadequate room, please attach in .doc or .pdf format) |
8. For this degree program, have your program outcomes been mapped to the Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs) found on Drexel One? DSLPs can be found by logging into one.drexel.edu, clicking on the EMPLOYEES tab, and downloading the file titled "Drexel Student Learning Priorities" listed under "Academic Information and Reports."

| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ____________ |
| Yes, and here is the mapping of program outcomes-to-DSLPs (If inadequate room, please attach in .doc or .pdf format) |

9. At present, please rate how developed is this degree program's assessment plan using the 4-point scale provided below. An assessment plan indicates the schedule for assessment of your program outcomes, the process by which you intend to "close the loop," and the time frame of other continuous assessment activities. Details on developing your program's assessment plan can be found online at Data Points by clicking here. Please contact Dr. Ziner with any questions about your program's assessment plan. A copy of the three-year plan, located at Data Points, will be provided at the meeting and reviewed.

| (1) Not at all Developed |
| (2) Somewhat Developed |
| (3) Moderately Developed Note: If you checked 2-4, please send your plan to Dr. Ziner. |
| (4) Fully Developed |

10. For this degree program, have you assessed at least ONE of your program outcomes using either a DIRECT assessment method (e.g., course assessments, embedded indicators within courses, capstones, and external exams) or an INDIRECT assessment method (e.g., student, employer, and alumni and industry advisory board surveys)?

<p>| (1) Yes, we have assessed at least one PO using a DIRECT method only. Please briefly describe the process and results in the space provided. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Yes, we have assessed at least one PO using an INDIRECT method only. Please briefly describe the process and results in the space provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Yes, we have assessed at least one PO using DIRECT and INDIRECT methods. Please briefly describe the process and results in the space provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>No, we have not yet begun to assess our POs but will begin during the following term: ______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. For this degree program, have you communicated any of these important assessment outcomes to the faculty who serve this program?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, this is a work in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and here are 1-3 examples of the way our program has communicated these important assessment outcomes to the faculty who serve this program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Have you used this degree program's assessment outcome results to inform decisions about any aspects of the program?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, this is a work in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and here are 1-3 examples of the way our program has used results to inform decisions about one or more aspects of the program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. For this degree program, do you currently have an annual assessment report (interim or final) indicating your assessment findings for the academic year and what steps you and your faculty plan to take to correct any deficiencies (i.e., "close the loop")? A **final** assessment report is required at the end of your degree program’s assessment cycle -- usually at the end of the third year. For a discussion on this topic, please visit Data Points or contact Dr. Ziner.

| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ____________ |
| Yes, and we will send the assessment report to Dr. Ziner ASAP in either .pdf or .doc format. |

14. Are your faculty members involved in assessment activities for this degree program in ANY capacity?

| Yes, and here are 2-3 ways our program has involved our faculty in the assessment process for this degree program: |
| No, but here are 2-3 ways *we plan to* involve our faculty in the assessment process: |

15. Does this degree program involve a co-op experience for your students? (*check one*)

| Yes  (Please complete survey items 16-18 below) |
| No |

**For programs with co-ops ONLY (next three survey items)**

16. For this degree program, have you used the employer and student co-op surveys to document student achievement of your program outcomes and the DSLPs?

| Yes, and I will submit my findings from the last cycle of co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP. |
| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ______________ |

17. For this degree program, have you used the employer and student co-op surveys to inform decisions about student learning in the program?

| Yes, and I will submit my findings from the last cycle of co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP. |
| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ______________ |

18. For this degree program, have you used the employer and student co-op surveys to inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys?

| Yes, and I will submit my findings from the last cycle of co-ops to Dr. Ziner ASAP. |
| No, this is a work in progress. Here is a time frame for completion: ______________ |

Thank you so much for your time and cooperation in completing this SPA survey!

If you have questions about anything requested of you in this survey (e.g., information or documentation), please contact Dr. Ziner immediately at (215) 571-3916 or send him an email.

Have a GREAT DAY!
Appendix E
Senior Exit Survey - Construction Management

2012 Senior Exit Survey - School of Technology and Professional Studies

Intro  The School of Technology and Professional Studies Graduating Senior Survey: Class of 2012

Congratulations on your upcoming graduation from Drexel University! This is a significant achievement and we are proud of your success. As part of the graduation process, we would like to request your help completing a short survey. The goal of the survey is to better understand your experiences at the University and your plans after graduation. Your input will help us improve the educational experiences and services we provide for current and future students. The survey should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. Please answer each question carefully and honestly. To start the survey, select the next (>>>) button at the bottom of the page. *NOTE: Please use the arrows at the bottom right corner of the screen to navigate through this survey. DO NOT use the back button in your browser!

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM1</th>
<th>How did you learn of Construction Management as a major?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>In addition to Drexel, which other Construction Management programs have you applied to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM3</td>
<td>What made you choose Drexel University?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM4</td>
<td>Do you have any regrets? If so, what are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM5</td>
<td>What changes would you make to improve the program for future CMGT students at Drexel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM6</td>
<td>Please list four (4) strengths of the Construction Management program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength 1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength 2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength 3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength 4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM7</td>
<td>Please list four (4) weaknesses of the Construction Management program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakness 1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakness 2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakness 3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakness 4 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the statements below, please rate the overall quality of the Construction Management education that you received while at Drexel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My education has equipped me with the ability to demonstrate leadership qualities as a result of experiential learning. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my education, I am able to apply various techniques and methods to efficiently and effectively plan and control construction projects. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Construction Management program has effectively provided me the skill to understand the value of and ability to apply sustainable building practices to optimize use of available resources. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the ability to facilitate communications, teamwork, and creativity to solve complex design and construction problems as a result of what I have learned in the CM program at Drexel. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CM9 Have you considered the MS in Construction Management at Drexel?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

CM10 Would you like to be contacted in reference to the Construction Management Alumni Association?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Appendix F
Student Evaluation of Employment Survey (Co-Op)

Student Employment Summary & Planner

A. Employment Information (Bold questions are required.)
   A1. This was my: (only co-op [4 yr.] | 1st co-op [5 yr.] | 2nd co-op [5 yr.] | 3rd co-op [5 yr.])
   A2. City of your job:
   A3. State of your job:
   A4. Country of your job:
   A5. Department in which you were employed:
   A6. Your supervisor's name:
   A7. Your job title:
   A8. Daily Schedule (ex. 8 am – 5 pm):
   A9. Number of days worked per week:
   A10. Gross weekly salary:
   A11. Other compensation:
   A12. Was shift work required? (Yes | No)
   A13. Was overtime required? (Yes | No)
   A14. If you traveled out of town, list destinations and purpose:
   A15. Was a car required to perform your job? (Yes | No)
   A16. How did you commute to work?
   A17. Was public transportation available for commuting? (Yes | No)
   A18. Did your employer assist you in securing housing? (Yes | No)
   A19. If you worked for an employer outside Philadelphia and you wish to share housing info about that area with other students, describe your housing arrangements and list the name, phone & address of a person a future co-op may contact for housing info.

B. Job Evaluation/Quality
Reflecting on your entire co-op experience, please indicate how each of the following areas aligned with your expectations.

B1. Opportunity to demonstrate own initiative
B2. Opportunity to develop leadership skills
B3. Opportunity for networking and professional development
B4. Opportunity for progressive responsibilities
B5. Variety of work assigned
B6. Quantity of work assigned
B7. Challenge of work assigned
B8. Training provided by employer
B9. Quality of employer supervision/mentorship
B10. Overall job satisfaction

Please note that there is a 20-minute system timeout. It is recommended that you complete your responses in a Word document and then paste your responses in the fields below.

B11. Describe the best features of your position and/or employer:
B12. Describe any challenges you experienced in the position and/or workplace:
B13. Briefly describe your job as you will on your resume:

C. The Drexel University Student Learning Priorities
Using the scale above, please rate your performance against colleagues at your company/organization at the same experience level.

C1. Communicate effectively through writing (reports, emails, official letters, etc.)
C2. Demonstrate effective verbal communication (discussion, presentations, etc.)
C3. Communicate appropriately with different audiences (colleagues, supervisors, clients, etc.)
C4. Provide feedback about assigned projects and tasks
C5. Contribute original and relevant ideas, strategies, or solutions
C6. Critically analyze and solve complex problems
C7. Uphold ethical standards in the workplace
C8. Make well-reasoned, informed decisions

Rated on the following scale:
Excellent
Very Good
Good
Fair
Poor
Unable to rate
C9. Use information effectively to accomplish a task  
C10. Set goals and monitor progress  
C11. Use appropriate technologies to complete assigned tasks  
C12. Work effectively with people who have diverse backgrounds, beliefs, values, or behaviors  
C13. Build professional relationships  
C14. Improve skills important to success in a field or industry  
C15. Effectively integrate into the workplace culture  

D. College Learning Outcomes  

E. Career Planner  

Please note that there is a 20-minute system timeout. It is recommended that you complete your responses in a Word document and then paste your responses in the fields below.  

E1. Please submit a 400 word reflective analysis on how one aspect of this co-op experience relates to a personal, academic, or professional goal that you are pursuing at Drexel. Be specific about both your goal and how one aspect of the co-op relates to this goal. Be sure to save this reflective analysis since you will be required to upload it to your Writing Portfolio.  
E2. Was this co-op relevant to your career objectives? (Yes | No)  
E3. Are you considering changing academic majors? (Yes | No)  
E4a. Would you consider returning to your current employer for another co-op or a full-time position? (Yes | No)  
E4b. Why/Why not?  
E5. What types of positions will you be considering for your next job search? (short response)  
E6. Are you considering national and/or international work experiences? (Yes | No)  
E7. Geographic preferences:  
E8. Are you considering graduate or professional school? (Yes | No with optional short response)  
E9. Describe your intended job search strategy for your next co-op or full-time position. (Check all that apply)  
   a. SCDConline  
   b. The Career Library  
   c. Networking with faculty  
   d. Networking with family & friends  
   e. Independent Search  
   f. Other  

F. SCDC Resources  

F1. The following SCDC resources were helpful during my job search:  
   a. COOP 101  
   b. Your co-op coordinator  
   c. SCDC online jobs database  
   d. SCDC Workshops  
   e. SCDC Career Fairs  
   f. Career Counseling  
   g. Career Librarian  
   h. Pre-Health and Pre-Law Advising  

F2. What information would have better prepared you for your job search? (short response)  

F3. The following SCDC resources were helpful while at my co-op job:  
   a. COOP 101  
   b. Your co-op coordinator  
   c. SCDC Workshops  
   d. Career Counseling  
   e. Pre-Health and Pre-Law Advising  

F4. What information would have better prepared you for your co-op position? (Check all that apply)  
   • Email and phone etiquette  
   • Professional dress  
   • Presentations and public speaking  
   • Resources available while on co-op  
   • How to handle issues in the workplace  
   • Building relationships/engaging in the workplace  
   • Other
Appendix G
Employer Evaluation of Employee Survey (Co-Op)

Employer Evaluation effective AY2010

Using the scale below, please rate the co-op student against all employees at your organization at the same experience level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Excellent</td>
<td>The student consistently performed at a superior level - one of the best in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Very Good</td>
<td>The student consistently performed at a high level - above average in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>The student consistently performed at an adequate level - average in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Fair</td>
<td>The student inconsistently performed at an adequate level - below average in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Poor</td>
<td>The student did not perform at an adequate level - well below average in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Rate</td>
<td>The student was not exposed to this area during the co-op experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Student Work Ethic

Please assess the student's performance in the following areas:

A1. Attendance
A2. Punctuality
A3. Initiative
A4. Leadership
A5. Time Management
A6. Dependability
A7. Interactions with others
A8. Working in teams
A9. Productivity (quality/quantity of work completed)
A10. Attitude appropriate to the workplace environment

B. The Drexel University Student Learning Priorities

Please assess the student's ability on each of the following outcomes as demonstrated during the co-op experience.

B1. Communicate effectively through writing (reports, emails, official letters, etc.)
B2. Demonstrate effective verbal communication (discussion, presentations, etc.)
B3. Communicate appropriately with different audiences (colleagues, supervisors, clients, etc.)
B4. Provide feedback about assigned projects and tasks
B5. Contribute original and relevant ideas, strategies, or solutions
B6. Critically analyze and solve complex problems
B7. Uphold ethical standards in the workplace
B8. Make well-reasoned, data-supported decisions
B9. Use information effectively to accomplish a task
B10. Set goals and monitor progress
B11. Use appropriate technologies to complete assigned tasks
B12. Work effectively with people who have diverse backgrounds, beliefs, values, or behaviors
B13. Build professional relationships
B14. Improve skills important to success in a field or industry
B15. Effectively integrate into the workplace culture and hierarchy

C. College Learning Outcomes (detailed by college/school on pages 8 and 9)

D. Overall Assessment

D1. What are the student's strengths?
D2. What are the student's weaknesses/areas for improvement?
D3a. Is this student's academic preparation oriented to the needs of your organization? (Yes | No)
D3b. What changes, if any, would you suggest for the academic preparation of this student?
D4. Please rate this student's overall performance: (Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor)
D5a. Would you consider hiring this student for a future co-op or full time position? (Yes | No)
D5b. Why/Why not?
D6. Please indicate your relationship with this student. (Supervisor | Human Resources/College Recruiter | Other)
Appendix H
Drexel Student Learning Priorities (DSLPs)

DREXEL STUDENT LEARNING PRIORITIES

Overview
Students graduating from Drexel University demonstrate competency in a field of study evidenced by achievement of a set of program-specific learning outcomes. In addition, they also demonstrate meaningful progress in six core intellectual and practical skill areas and five experiential and applied learning areas. Learning in these core areas supports, and is integrated with, learning in their disciplines. Students exhibit levels of competency in each of these areas appropriate to their program of study, their individual interests, and their abilities. The Drexel Student Learning Priorities provide the framework for a broad education across disciplines and lay the foundation for a successful future.

Core Intellectual and Practical Skills

Upon graduation, students will demonstrate an improved ability to...

COMMUNICATION
Employ an understanding of audience, purpose and context to communicate effectively in a range of situations using appropriate media

CREATIVE AND CRITICAL THINKING
Use divergent (e.g., generation of novel ideas, thinking out of the box, brainstorming) and convergent thinking (e.g., critical thinking, evaluation of ideas, quantitative and qualitative analysis, scientific reasoning) to generate novel and relevant ideas, strategies, approaches, or products

ETHICAL REASONING
Assess their own ethical values and the social context of ethical problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to an ethical problem, and consider the consequences of alternative actions

INFORMATION LITERACY
Possess the skills and knowledge to access, evaluate and use information effectively, competently, and creatively

Website | www.drexel.edu/provost/learningPriorities
Contact | dslp@drexel.edu
SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING
Establish goals and monitor progress toward them by developing an awareness of the personal, environmental and task-specific factors that affect attainment of the goals.

TECHNOLOGY USE
Make appropriate use of technologies to communicate, collaborate, solve problems, make decisions, and conduct research, as well as foster creativity and life-long learning.

Experiential and Applied Learning
Upon graduation, students will demonstrate an improved ability to...

GLOBAL COMPETENCE
Engage in, reflect upon, and demonstrate open mindedness toward all issues of diversity at the local, national and international level.

LEADERSHIP
Develop a vision, translate that vision into shared goals, and effectively work with others to achieve these goals.

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Apply knowledge and skills gained from a program of study to the achievement of goals in a work, clinical, or other professional setting.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE EXPRESSION
Make meaningful contributions in their chosen field, participating in use-inspired (e.g., inspired by and applied to real-world problems) research, scholarship or creative activity as an individual or in a collaborative effort.

RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP
Create and sustain a healthy, engaged, public life.

Define Your Own Priorities
Upon graduation, students will...

BUILD YOUR FUTURE
Continue to develop the goals, values, and aspirations that have guided them through their Drexel education into a foundation for a successful future.
Appendix I
University Learning Assessment Goals (Spring 2012)

University Learning Assessment Goals for Spring 2012

Overview | Learning and Accountability
The purpose of this document is to communicate a set of goals we want to achieve to support our efforts to improve and document teaching and learning at Drexel University. While this effort to support learning assessment at the institution is not primarily focused on compliance with Middle States accreditation standards, providing a clear indication of where we want to be at the time of the Middle States reaffirmation of accreditation visit in the spring of 2012 will both support a successful visit and move our own learning assessment goals forward.

The following goals comprise what minimally needs to be achieved to support a successful MSCHF visit in the area of learning assessment. Please forward any questions or concerns to:

Craig Bach, Chair, University Committee on Learning Assessment
Associate Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment
Office of the Provost
bachon@drexel.edu | 215.895.2200

Learning Assessment Goals for Spring 2012

COURSE LEVEL | All courses offered at the university (online, hybrid, or traditional) will...
[C-1] Develop syllabi that contain statements (e.g., outcomes, objectives, competencies, or performance criteria) of expected student learning.

PROGRAM/ACADEMIC UNIT LEVEL, 1 | All degree programs (online, blended, or campus/on-site) and identified academic units will...
[P-1] Develop a student learning assessment plan.
[P-2] Communicate statements of expected learning for students graduating from the program (working with the unit) in ways that are easily understandable by students and other stakeholders.
[P-3] Indicate which courses and other educational experiences support the expected learning for the degree program (academic unit) – e.g., curricular/educational experience mapping.
[P-4] (Undergraduate Programs) Align statements of expected learning for the program (academic unit) to Drexel’s institution-level student learning priorities. Graduate programs develop alignments as appropriate.
[P-5] (Undergraduate Programs with Co-ops) Use the employer and student co-op surveys to 1) document student achievement of the Drexel Student Learning Priorities, 2) inform decisions about student learning in the program (academic unit), and 3) inform discussions about ways to improve the surveys. Two cycles are completed. Graduate programs meet goal as appropriate.
[P-6] Assess student achievement of at least one program-level (academic unit-level) learning goal for each program, using both indirect and direct methods of assessment, communicate the results to faculty, and use the collected information to inform decisions about the program.
[P-7] Clearly and transparently document and communicate the use of learning assessment data.

1 For the purposes of this document the term 'program' refers to a degree program. The term 'academic unit' refers to other offices, units, or course/course sequences that directly support student learning and may not be "owned" by a degree program (e.g., student life, civic engagement activities, UNIV 101, The Great Works Symposium, Co-op 101).
ENDNOTES


ii Details of this framework appeared in a presentation titled “Cultivating and Nurturing a Culture of Sustainable Assessment in a College with Diverse Programs” which was delivered at the 2012 ABET Symposium held in St. Louis, Missouri on April 20, 2012 and at an assessment conference held on-campus at Drexel University on August 7, 2012.

iii Academic Evaluation, Feedback and Intervention System (AEFIS) is the web-based assessment management system used at Drexel University to facilitate the collection and application of assessment data. As of the fall term 2013, all Goodwin College programs have entered levels 3 and 4 (i.e., access is now permitted to all four levels). The software platform enables the continuous quality improvement of curriculum and fosters personalized learning by engaging Drexel administrators, faculty and students. AEFIS functionality includes course-based student and faculty surveys, aggregate and graphical results of assessment data, and mid-term/end of term assessments.

iv Program Educational Objectives (PEOs) are required by professional accrediting councils such as ABET (see Engineering Technology) and ACCE (see Construction Management). They refer to the knowledge, skills and professional attitudes we expect our program graduates to have (and demonstrate) 3-5 years beyond graduation. Programs that are not professionally accredited have the option of documenting and measuring PEOs as part of their assessment plans. The establishment of PEOs is not a requirement of regional accrediting commissions such as the MSCHE (“Middle States”).

v For example, all Goodwin College programs that do not offer a co-op experience cannot respond to assessment activities seven through ten listed in Table One on page 5 of this report.

vi The administration of Goodwin College and the CMGT faculty and staff are grateful for the good work and steadfast leadership of Dr. Zeljko “Z” Torbica as the former CMGT Program Director. He played a central role helping the program to achieve and sustain professional accreditation through the American Council for Construction Education (ACCE). We are also grateful to have Dr. Robert Muir as the new CMGT Program Director, as of the summer 2012.