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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What are the learning objectives?** | **How, where, and when are they assessed?** | **What are the expectations?** | **What are the results?** | **Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared?** |
| **1. Content Area Knowledge**: Students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding representing appropriate breadth and depth in the physical, emotional, social, and economic aspects of aging. Students will also demonstrate an understanding of current theories of aging. | a) **Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge (CCK) Written Paper Capstone Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students completing the written capstone will be evaluated on their knowledge and understanding of specialized aging content.  b) **Thesis Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students defending theses will be evaluated on their knowledge and understanding of specialized aging topics and the research methods process.  c) **Internship Mid-term Self-Evaluation Forms** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate perceived knowledge and understanding of aging studies content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., aging issues/trends, communication, ethical practice).  d) **Internship Final Self-Evaluation Forms** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate perceived knowledge and understanding of aging studies content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., aging issues/trends, communication, ethical practice).  e) **Internship Mid-term Site Supervisor Evaluation Forms** [an indirect measure]: Site supervisors indicate students’ knowledge and understanding of aging studies content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., aging issues/trends, communication, ethical practice).  f) **Internship Site Supervisor Final Student Evaluation Forms** [an indirect measure]: Site supervisors indicate students’ knowledge and understanding of aging studies content criteria and professional performance levels (e.g., aging issues/trends, communication, ethical practice).  g) **Certification of Comprehensive Knowledge (CCK) Oral Presentation Capstone Rubric** [direct measure; course embedded]: Students completing the oral presentation capstone will be evaluated on their knowledge and understanding of specialized aging content and ability to apply knowledge/understanding to professional career development.  h) **Area Agency on Aging Paper Rubric and Assignment Grade** [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the FCS 5100 Societal Theories of Aging (a required course) will be evaluated on the following specifications and competencies of the assignment.  The Area Agency on Aging assignment aligns with the mission of the Older Americans Act: to oversee the development of services and opportunities for older people in every community across the nation. The Older Americans Act contains 10 objectives related to enhancing the dignity and independence of older adults in all realms of life, regardless of economic status. Title II of the Older Americans Act established an "aging network," to provide funding for local service programs, establish training and research projects, and stimulate the development of innovative and/or improved services for the elderly.  For this assignment, students are assigned a state. The paper is written as though the student is that state’s Executive Director of the Area Agency on Aging and as though the student will present the content of this paper to the state’s Governor, the Director of the State Unit on Aging, and aging policy-makers.  The paper is evaluated on students’: explanation /summary of current AAA programs in the state; identification and discussion of three state shortcomings/gaps regarding integration of older adults within communities; proposal of three new state programs in accordance with the Older Americans Act. | a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) or higher in their knowledge and understanding of aging topics and theories. The 5-point scale described here and throughout the report includes:  5=highly competent  4=competent  3=somewhat competent  2=minimally competent  1=not competent    b) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their knowledge and understanding of gerontological topics and theories.  c) At least 85% of students completing midterm evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 4 on a 5-point scale.  d) At least 85% of students completing final evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 4 on a 5-point scale.  e) At least 85% of internship site supervisors completing midterm evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 4 on a 5-point scale.  f) At least 85% of internship site supervisors completing final evaluations will indicate competency by achieving at least a rating of 4 on a 5-point scale.  g) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty reviewer will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) or higher in their knowledge, understanding, and application of aging topics and theories.  h) At least 85% of the rubric evaluations submitted by faculty teaching the course will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) on the assignment.  For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%.  . | a) Using the CCK rubric, 100% (N=9) of the evaluations rated students higher than the expectations. All students earned ratings of a 5 (highly competent) on a 5-point scale.  b) No Aging Studies students completed a thesis during AY 18-19.  c) 100% (N=1) of the students who completed the midterm evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (5 on a 5-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.  d) 100% (N=1) of the students who completed the final evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (5 on a 5-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.  e) 100% (N=1) of the site supervisors who completed the midterm evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (5 on a 5-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.  f) 100% (N=1) of the site supervisors who completed the final evaluations indicated ratings of “highly competent” (5 on a 5-point scale) on both the midterm and final self-evaluations.  g) Using the data gathered from the CCK rubric, 100% (N=9) of the evaluations submitted rated students higher than the expectations in the previous column. All students earned ratings of a 5 (highly competent) on a 5-point scale.  h) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all 10 Aging Studies students taking FCS 5100. 100% (N=10) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale).  For the assignment grades, 100% (N=10) of students met the minimum expectations and the scores ranged from 94-100% (*M*=98%). | a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student’s academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. If needed (e.g., average rubric rating below a 3, unforeseen problematic circumstances), additional Aging Studies or FCS graduate faculty reviewers evaluate the CCK capstone.  Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  b) Thesis committee members evaluate the student’s performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  c) Students completing internships submit an “Internship Self-Evaluation” at the mid-term of the semester. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  d) Students completing internships submit an “Internship Self-Evaluation” at the conclusion of the semester. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  e) Site Supervisors complete an evaluation of the student at the mid-term of the semester. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  f) Site Supervisors complete an evaluation of the student at conclusion of the semester. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  g) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student’s academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  h) Faculty teaching FCS 5100 evaluate each student’s paper. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor, as well. |
| **2. Critical Thinking**: Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills with regards to aging topics. | a) **CCK Capstone Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students completing CCK capstone written papers and oral presentations will be evaluated on their ability to think critically regarding aging topics.  b) **Thesis Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students defending theses will be evaluated on their ability to think critically regarding aging topics.  c) **Research Proposal Presentation Rubric and Assignment Grade** [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the FCS 5900 Research Methods (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to think critically regarding aging research through formulation and presentation of the proposals’ introductory, review of literature, and methodology sections. | a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging topics.  b) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging topics.    c) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty teaching the course will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging research.  For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%. | a) Faculty evaluations were rated 100% (N=9) of students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to think critically regarding aging topics.  b) No Aging Studies students completed a thesis during AY 18-19.  c) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all 7 Aging Studies students taking FCS 5900. 87.5% (n=6) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale).  For the assignment grades, 87.5% (n=6) of students’ scores met the minimum expectations and scores of all 7 students ranged from 83-100% (*M*=91%). | a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student’s academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  b) Thesis committee members evaluate the student’s performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  c) Faculty teaching FCS 5900 evaluate each student, who completes a research proposal presentation in the course. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor, as well. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Communication:**  Students will display the ability to communicate effectively and professionally information about aging in their written and oral work | a) **CCK Capstone Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students completing the CCK Capstone will be evaluated on their ability to communicate effectively and professionally.  b) **Internship Supervisor’s Evaluation Forms (Mid-term):** On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to communication effectively and professionally in their written and oral work.  c) **Internship Supervisor’s Evaluation Forms (Final):** On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to communication effectively and professionally in their written and oral work.  d) **Aging Policy Paper Rubric and Assignment Grade** [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in FCS 5400 Aging Policy in Action (a required course) will be evaluated on the following assignment and competencies.  This assignment represents a synthesis of the various current issues and trends covered in this course. The assignment is comprehensive and allows for fact-finding, creativity in written presentation of information, and critical reflection and application. Each student is assigned a different topic with the end goal in mind of best preparing students for careers related to serving individuals, families, communities, and our diverse and global society. For the purpose of the paper, students consider the unique and shared characteristics of older adults ages 62 and over. In addition, students consider the potential for very different needs at age 62 versus 92 or that two 75-year old individuals may have very different needs, for example. Age is only one descriptor of an individual or group.  The assignment is evaluated on the following parts: introduction (general overview of topic, key facts/statistics, historical issues and trends); body of the paper (expansion on facts/statistics, discussion of current policy and programming issues and trends, description of national/state/local support services); and application to professional practice and future vision (discussion of future implications for older adults, families/caregivers, and aging network professionals, description of future policy- and program- related needs and developments, conclusions). | a) At least 85% of the CCK evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to effectively communicate information about aging orally and in writing.    b) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to communicate information about aging effectively orally and in writing.  c) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to communicate information about aging effectively orally and in writing.  d) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to communicate effectively (in writing) in their papers.  For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%. | a) 100% (N=9) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to communicate effectively in their writing and oral presentations.  b) 100% (N=1) of the mid-term evaluations rated students with at least a 4 on a 5-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the mid-term.  c) 100% (N=1) of the final evaluations rated students with at least a 4 on a 5-point scale in their ability to effectively communicate in their writing and oral presentations. The student earned a rating of 5 at the final.  d) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all 11 Aging Studies students taking FCS 5400. 100% (n=11) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale).  For the assignment grades, 100% (n=11) of students’ scores met the minimum expectations and scores ranged from 90-100% (*M*=96%). | a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student’s academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  b) The internship supervisor completes the evaluation and submits the evaluation to the student and the academic adviser, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  c) The internship supervisor completes the evaluation and submits the evaluation to the student and the academic adviser, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where and how changes or improvements need to be made.  d) Faculty teaching FCS 5400 evaluate each student who writes the paper in the course. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor to provide feedback opportunity, as well. |
| **4. Research:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of research design and implementation, data analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results in the context of current theories in aging. Students will also exhibit understanding of current research in the older adult population. | a) **Thesis Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students defending theses well be evaluated on their understanding of research design and implementation, data analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results.  b) **Research Proposal Presentation Rubric and Assignment Grade** [direct measure; course embedded]: Students enrolled in the FCS 5900 Research Methods (a required course) will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate an understanding of research design and implementation, data analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results in the context of current theories in aging. Students will also exhibit understanding of current research in the older adult population. | a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their understanding of research design and implementation, data analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of results.    b) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as at least competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their understanding of aging research.  For the assignment grade, at least 85% of students will earn at least a minimum score of an 85%, | a) No Aging Studies students completed a thesis during AY 18-19.  b) Rubric evaluations and assignment grades were submitted for all 7 Aging Studies students taking FCS 5900. 87.5% (n=6) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale).  For the assignment grades, 87.5% (n=6) of students’ scores met the minimum expectations and the scores of all 7 students ranged from 83-100% (*M*=91%). | a) Thesis committee members evaluate the student’s performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty members). Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  b) Faculty teaching FCS 5900 evaluate each student, who completes a research proposal presentation in the course. Assessment data, including course assignment samples/outcomes, are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. Follow up discussion is initiated with course instructor, as well. |
| **5. Ethical Behavior:** Students will interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults; and demonstrate understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers. Students will also exhibit an awareness of the diversity of the older adult population through their coursework in the program. | a) **Thesis Rubric -** Thesis [a direct measure]: Students defending theses well be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate an understanding of the challenges specific to older adults and their caregivers and exhibit an awareness of the diversity of the older population.  b) **Site Supervisors' Mid-Term Evaluations (Forms) of Interns** [a direct measure]: On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  c) **Site Supervisors' Final Evaluations (Forms) of Interns** [a direct measure]: On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  d) **Internship Mid-Term Self-Evaluation Form** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population.  e) **Internship Final Self-Evaluation Form** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population. | a) At least 85% of the evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to demonstrate an understanding of the challenges specific to older adults and their caregivers and exhibit an awareness of the diversity of the older population.    b) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as “Competent” (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  c) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as “Competent” (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  d) At least 85% of students completing internship will indicate a “Competent” level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) confidence in their (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population.  e) At least 85% of students completing internship will indicate a “Competent” level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) confidence in their (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population. | a) No Aging Studies students completed a thesis during AY 18-19.  b) 100% (N=1) of the students enrolled in an internship were rated as Highly Competent (5) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  c) 100% (N=1) of the students completing an internship were rated as Highly Competent (5) in their ability in their ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults.  d) 100% (N=1) of the students enrolled in an internship indicated a “Highly Competent (5) level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) confidence in their (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population.  e) 100% (N=1) of the students completing an internship indicated a “Highly Competent (5) level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) confidence in their (1) ability to interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with older adults, (2) understanding of the cognitive, physical, emotional, and sociocultural challenges specific to older adults and their families and caregivers, and (3) awareness of the diversity of the older adult population. | a) Thesis committee members evaluated students’ performance. (Each thesis committee consists of 3 faculty). Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  b) On-site internship supervisors will evaluate each student under their supervision. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  c) On-site internship supervisors will evaluate each student under their supervision. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  d) Students enrolled in internships will complete an “Internship Self-Evaluation.”  Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  e) Students completing internships will complete an “Internship Self-Evaluation.”  Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. |
| **6. Integration:** Students will demonstrate the ability to connect and apply knowledge gained in Aging Studies coursework, internships, and research experiences in professional settings; and will reflect on such learning with meaning and purpose as part of their intellectual and personal development. | a) **CCK Capstone** **Rubric** [a direct measure]: Students completing the CCK capstone will be evaluated on their ability to connect and apply knowledge and reflect on their learning.  b) **Supervisor’s Mid-Term Evaluation (Forms) of Interns** [a direct measure]- On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to connect and apply knowledge gained and reflect on their learning with meaning and purpose.  c) **Supervisor’s Final Evaluation (Forms) of Interns** [a direct measure]- On-site internship supervisors will evaluate interns on their ability to connect and apply knowledge gained and reflect on their learning with meaning and purpose.  d) **Internship Mid-term Self-Evaluation Forms -** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived ability to integrate knowledge gained in their course work to their internship experience  e) **Internship Final Self-Evaluation Forms -** [an indirect measure]: Students indicate their perceived ability to integrate knowledge gained in their course work to their internship experience | a) At least 85% of the CCK evaluations submitted by faculty will rate students as competent (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to connect and apply knowledge gained and reflect on such learning with meaning.  b) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as at least “Competent” (4 on a 5-point scale) on questions related to interns’ ability to integrate knowledge and reflect on it.  c) At least 85% of the internship evaluations submitted by supervisors will rate students as at least “Competent” (4 on a 5-point scale) on questions related to interns’ ability to integrate knowledge and reflect on it.  d) At least 85% of students enrolled in an internship will indicate a “Competent” level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to ability to connect and apply knowledge from coursework into their internship experience.  e) At least 85% of students completing internship will indicate a “Competent” level of confidence (4 on a 5-point scale) in their ability to ability to connect and apply knowledge from coursework into their internship experience. | a) 100% (N=9) of the evaluations rated students as highly competent (5 on a 5-point scale) on their ability to integrate knowledge gained and to reflect on it with meaning and purpose.  b) 100% (N=1) of internship supervisors rated students’ ability to integrate knowledge as “Highly Competent” (5) on a 5-point scale.  c) 100% (N=1) of internship supervisors rated students’ ability to integrate knowledge as “Highly Competent” (5) on a 5-point scale.  d) 100% (N=1) of students enrolled in an internship rated their level of confidence as “Highly Competent” (5) (on a 5-point scale) in their ability to connect and apply knowledge from coursework and research into their internship.  e) 100% (N=1) of students enrolled in an internship rated their level of confidence as “Highly Competent” (5) (on a 5-point scale) in their ability to connect and apply knowledge from coursework and research into their internship. | a) The CCK capstone is evaluated by the student’s academic advisor, who is also the graduate coordinator. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  b) Internship site supervisor will complete final evaluation of interns’ performance. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  c) Internship site supervisor will complete final evaluation of interns’ performance. Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  d) Students enrolled in an internship will complete an “Internship Self-Evaluation.” Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made.  e) Students completing internships will complete an “Internship Self-Evaluation.” Results are disseminated to the Aging Studies Board faculty/administrators during semester meetings and discussed to ascertain where, how, and if changes or improvements need to be made. |

**PART TWO**

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

Aging Studies faculty members, Departmental Chairs and/ Graduate Coordinators, College Deans, and the Graduate School Dean comprise EIU’s Aging Studies Board, which meets once each fall and spring semester. Before those meetings, assessment plans and the assessment response report are disseminated to the board and, during meetings, the plans and the response report are discussed at the meetings. For AY 2018-2018, there continues to be 100% “buy-in” of the entire Board on the direction of assessment (e.g., rubrics, assignment grading, selected courses, internship evaluations, capstone experience).

**Learning Objectives:**

The same objectives were retained and continue to align with the goals established by CGS. As advised in the Student Learning Assessment Program Response to Summary Form, the wording of objective #3 was tweaked to read: *Students will display the ability to communicate effectively and professionally information about aging in their written and oral work.*

**How, Where, and When Assessed:**

-Direct measures of rubrics were retained and used to collect/analyze data from students’ written work and oral presentations. Indirect measures of student and internship site supervisor evaluations were retained and used to collect/analyze data.

-All Aging Studies students are required to complete one of the following during the program: an internship, an independent study, or a thesis. The thesis assessment remains in place, although no students chose this option during AY 2018-2019. For the students enrolled during AY 2018-2019, a non-thesis plan of study was best aligned with their current and future career goals and paths. The vast majority of Aging Studies students are currently employed full- or part-time in the professional aging network. Therefore, an internship or an independent study is a more suitable match for their career paths, especially since pursuit of a Ph.D. or a research-intensive career position is not the goal of most.

-In AY 2018-2019, for direct measures embedded in courses, written papers in FCS 5100, FCS 5400, and FCS 5900 and the presentation in FCS 5900 continued to be included for more assessment breadth and diversity in types of major assignments.

-A continued strength of this current report is that the required course assignments reflect a comprehensive and holistic picture of three fundamental tenets of a graduate program’s courses: research (FCS 5900 Research Methods), theory (FCS 5100 Societal Theories in Aging), and policy (Aging Policy in Action).

**Expectations**

-Rating expectations of a minimum of 4 on a 5-point scale for rubric items were retained and demonstrate appropriate rigor of graduate study expectations.

-Percentage benchmarks for all expectations were retained at a minimum of 85% to continue to align with the rigor of graduate student expectations.

**Results**

-Results have aligned with and/or improved since the 2017-2018 assessment report. All expectations set forth for 2018-2019 were achieved and exceeded the expectation criteria. Results indicate that the Aging Studies curriculum continues to be well-developed and implemented.

-The Aging Studies Board continues as a cohesive and valuable advisory group comprised of faculty and administrators. The AY 2017-2018 Student Learning Assessment Program Response to Summary Form was very well received by all and, during the fall and spring semesters, assessment discussion and critical reflection on assessment outcomes continued at board meetings.

-The 33 required program hours, the online program delivery mode, and the 6- or 8-week scheduling of the majority of classes continue to greatly benefit the program. All of those program/curriculum revisions strengthen our recruitment efforts (i.e., enrollment has steadily grown), retention rates (retention rates are in the upper 90th percentile), and academic performance levels (course grades, internship evaluations, and capstone experiences are being completed with high performance marks). The current program and course configurations are highly responsive to meet the needs of our student demographic. Most students are employed full- or part time, fall into middle age brackets with family/personal/financial obligations differing from the late teen/early twenties age group students, and reside outside of the Charleston area. To successfully continue with recruitment/enrollment, retention, and academic performance levels, Aging Studies must continue to offer a high-quality graduate degree program with ease in accessibility, flexibility for diverse students, and cost efficiency. These key considerations assist in guiding all program efforts, including the area of assessment practices.

**How Results Will Be Used**

-The feedback loop and advisory board remains in place for regular communication and in-person meetings throughout the year and data continued to be shared with the board and course instructors.

**PART THREE**

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

Curriculum, instructional, and learning objectives, assessment measures, expectations, results, and dissemination practices are sound at this time, formal and anecdotal student evaluation feedback has been positive, enrollment (N=21 as of June 2019) has increased, retention and graduation rates (upper 90th percentile) are high, and the interdisciplinary Aging Studies Board is supportive and actively engaged in program and curriculum development. Each semester in AY 2018-2019, the Graduate Coordinator and Aging Studies Board have reviewed the existing curriculum and instruction practices. For this year, no substantive or additional major curriculum/instructional changes were deemed necessary and last year’s assessment response validated such decisions.

In the future, Aging Studies will: continue with existing data collection and analysis procedures; continue involving the Aging Studies Board in assessment-related discussion and feedback; contingent upon funding, apply for the new national accreditation for aging studies graduate programs; and apply for First Choice designation from the EIU Council on Graduate Studies.