Appendix A3

Office of University Assessment
B. Do you have measurable goals to meet employers’ current needs? If so, please provide them. How often are these goals updated?

The University has measurable goals as part of its Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) to meet employers’ current needs of graduates who are equipped with appropriate writing and critical thinking skills. In the 2004-2012 university strategic plan, under goal 1.3, “academic enhancement and improvement”, strategy 1.3.3 is to “enhance student assessment”. Performance measures include analyzing and documenting student performance related to the mandated ALCs. Under goal 1.2, “continuous enhancement and assessment of the student experience”, of the 2010-2020 university strategic plan, strategy 1.2.3 is to “enhance critical thinking skills of undergraduate students”. The ALCs are updated on an annual basis as part of the review process of all assessment reports submitted by academic programs to the Office of University Assessment (OUA).

The Florida Board of Governors, in articulating the importance of student achievement in its strategic planning and accountability processes, expects all public institutions to report periodically on the progress of the State Mandated ALCs. This requires each program to report the status of the following student learning outcomes: communication, critical thinking, and content knowledge. Each Program ALC is required to identify the corresponding assessment processes used to measure student achievement on each of the core student learning outcomes for the program. These assessment processes are meant to specify:

- The required courses or other academic equivalents through which all students pursuing the baccalaureate degree are assessed on each outcome,
- The assessment methods used in those courses or academic equivalents that correspond to each outcome, and
- The standards used during the assessments to determine if student work matches the expectations articulated for each outcome.

In February 2005, the FAMU Institutional Level Assessment Committee (ILAC), as part of its assessment oversight function prepared the “FAMU’s Academic Learning Compacts Policies and Procedures” in response to the Division of Colleges and Universities Policy Guideline (PG 04.08.26) on the Academic Learning Compacts mandated by the Board of Governors for all state universities in Florida. The Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate reviewed the document and the Faculty Senate subsequently approved it at the April 19, 2005 meeting. The document was also reviewed by the Provost and submitted to the BOT. The Academic Affairs committee of the BOT approved the document at the June 25th meeting. The BOT finally approved the document on June 30, 2005. The following implementation plan was developed by ILAC.

- Phase I: The Establishment of the Assessment Infrastructure (Spr04 – Spr05)
- Phase II: The Establishment of the Assessment Training Program (Spr04 – Cont)
- Phase III: The Development of the ALC Detailed Implementation Plan (Fall04 – Fall05)
- Phase IV: The Design and Development of the Academic Learning Compacts (Fall04 – Sum06)
- Phase V: The Refinement of the Academic Learning Compacts (Sum06 – Cont)
- Phase VI: The Approval of the ALC Implementation Plan (Spr05 – Fall05)
- Phase VII: The Availability of the Academic Learning Compacts to Incoming Freshmen and Other Students (Spr05 - Cont)
- Phase VIII: The Implementation of the Academic Learning Compacts (Sum04 – Spr07)
- Phase IX: The Development and Submission of Mandated Reports on Assessment. (Sum06 – Cont)

FAMU uses the FAMOUS Assessment Approach, a six-step assessment model described below, to document the implementation and the results of the ALCs. Academic programs use tools such as rubrics, products of student work, and other course-embedded measures periodically to assess the extent to which student learning has taken place are accomplished. Teams of faculty at the program level and the college/school assessment committees in conjunction with the OUA review the ALCs and related results annually.
Description of the FAMOUS Assessment Approach

Step 1: Formulate statements of outcomes/objectives aligned to the institutional mission/goals;
Step 2: Ascertain criteria for success;
Step 3: Measure student/service performance using direct and indirect methods;
Step 4: Observe and analyzing results for congruence between expected and actual outcomes;
Step 5: Use the results to effect improvement of instructional programs and administrative and educational support services; and
Step 6: Strengthening programs and services by continuously evaluating, planning, allocating resources and implementing new approaches to ensure congruence between expected and actual outcomes.

Each year the OUA submits an ALC status report to the Board of Governors indicating which instructional programs have provided evidence that their program is in the continuous improvement mode. This information is collected from the assessment reports submitted by each program. Over the past 5 years, the number of programs in continuous improvement (CI) mode increased. The following table shows the percentages of programs in CI for 6 of the 7 products/processes listed by the BOG. Product 6 is not included in the table because it doesn’t receive the same rating as the other process/products. It only requires a link to ALCs for programs undergoing program reviews. The decrease in 2010 can be attributed to changes in administration in a number of programs. The program level ALCs are posted at http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&CurrentALCs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Reporting Year</th>
<th>1. PROCESS: Expected core student learning outcomes.</th>
<th>2. PRODUCT: Core learning expectations POSTED ON THE WEB.</th>
<th>3. PROCESS: How expectations are assessed in program.</th>
<th>4. PRODUCT: EXAMPLES of how expectations are assessed in the program POSTED ON THE WEB.</th>
<th>5. PROCESS: System of program assessment/evaluation.</th>
<th>7. PROCESS: Use of information to improve student achievement and program effectiveness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.22%</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>61.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>96.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>98.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
<td>93.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Do you have measurable goals for each graduate in the areas of writing proficiency and critical thinking? If so, please send them to me with the goals and include the results for the last five to ten years.

In the 2004-2012 university strategic plan, goal 1.3 is dedicated to academic enhancement and improvement. Strategy 1.3.3 is dedicated to the “enhance student assessment”. Performance measures include the articulation and refinement of student learning outcomes, and analyzing and documenting student performance related to the mandated ALCs.

The University's strategic plan “2020 Vision”, indicates that “graduates will demonstrate the following competencies identified in the academic learning compacts and in the general education outcomes—critical thinking, communication, content knowledge, collaboration, life-long learning and respect for diversity” (p. 4). Under goal 1.2, “continuous enhancement and assessment of the student experience”, of the strategic plan, strategy 1.2.3 is to “enhance critical thinking skills of undergraduate students”.

In line with the previous and current strategic plans, the university's measurable learning outcomes for each graduate with regards to writing proficiency and critical thinking skills are stated as follows:
Communication: Graduates to demonstrate competence in writing, reading and speaking.  
Critical thinking skills: Graduates apply critical thinking to learning and real-world situations.

Each instructional program uses the FAMOUS Assessment Approach to assess and improve students' writing and critical thinking skills along with other learning outcomes. The following table provides examples of results on target goals set for critical thinking and communication skills in various programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Informatics and Information Management(B.S.)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre(B.A.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry(B.S.)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences Institute (B.S.)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Graduates who met the requirement for Critical Thinking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Informatics and Information Management(B.S.)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre(B.A.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry(B.S.)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences Institute (B.S.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of how students' writing and critical thinking skills are assessed and improved are provided below. Full assessment reports, collected from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010 of all programs, can be found at [http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment#](http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment#).

Selected Examples

Health Information Management (BS) 2005-2006

Outcome: Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication and critical thinking skills about issues in the HIM profession.

Criteria: All graduating students will score 70% or better on the HIM 4344 Departmental Layout Project graded by faculty using an appropriate rubric designed to evaluate proficiency in oral and written communication. 90% of graduating students responding to the Exit Interview Survey will indicate the HIM Program prepared them for critical thinking on the certification examination and in professional practice. 90% of graduates responding to the Graduate Survey critical thinking item will indicate the HIM Program prepared them for critical thinking on the certification examination and in professional practice with a rating of 4 or above (on a scale of 1-5). 90% of graduates responding to the Graduate Survey communication item will indicate the HIM Program prepared them to communicate effectively in professional practice with a rating of 4 or above (on a scale of 1-5).

Results: 97% of graduating students scored 70% or better on the HIM 4344 Departmental Layout Project. 100% of graduating students responding to the Exit Interview Survey indicated the HIM Program prepared them for critical thinking on the certification examination and in professional practice. 92% of graduates responding to the Graduate Survey critical thinking item indicated the HIM Program prepared them for critical thinking on the certification examination and in professional practice with a rating of 4 or above (on a scale of 1-5). 100% of graduates responding
to the Graduate Survey communication item indicated the HIM Program prepared them to communicate effectively in professional practice with a rating of 4 or above (on a scale of 1-5).

Use of Results: The program has continued to monitor the knowledge and skills that are being taught and reinforced current projects/assignments to improve communication skills.

Chemical Engineering (MS): 2006-2007

Outcome: Communication Skills: Upon completion of the Master's degree, the student will be able to demonstrate oral and written communication skills in the technical aspects of chemical engineering.

Criteria: The direct assessment measures used were class presentations and reports in graduate level courses, thesis defense, and presentations in technical meetings. Master's students in the Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering are required to take a set of at least seven (7) graduate level courses during their academic careers. Many of these courses include in-class oral presentations as well as written reports on technical matters. At the end of their first year, students start working on an original research problem. Once their committees approve the plan of research, students are expected to make an original research contribution in their research area. A written thesis is required along with a public oral defense. This assessment will require that 80% of the students being assessed score 75% or higher as determined by the above assessment standards.

Results: Class presentations were required in Advanced Transport Phenomena I (ECH5261) and Research Methods in Chemical Engineering ECH 5052. Based on the fact that 80% of the class in ECH 5261 performed satisfactorily in this component, it was concluded that this outcome was satisfied. In ECH 5052, more than 90% of the students performed satisfactorily in the written assignments and showed significant improvement over the course of the semester. The majority of students (>90%) scored satisfactory on the oral presentations also. There was one student who defended a ChE master's degree this semester, and in the judgment of the thesis committee, this student showed mastery of oral and written communications. One Chemical Engineering Masters degree student was a coauthor on a poster presentation at a technical meeting this semester.

Use of Results: The results from the assessment indicated that the oral and written communications outcome was met, but continual evaluation of students was necessary to fully assess this outcome. It is recommended at this stage that the department continue to work towards further improving oral and written communications skills by requiring projects in the graduate classes and sponsoring technical writing workshops. As recommended in the results from 2005-2006, the Department sponsored a half-day workshop on technical writing conducted by a professor of English from Florida State University. This workshop focused on the basic aspects of technical writing and was well received by the graduate students. The levels of learning were developed for the graduate courses during the spring semester.

Economics (BA/BS) 2006-2007

Outcome: Communication Skills: Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in their ability to present an oral and written presentation in the capstone courses, which include ECP 4703: Managerial Economics, ECO 4713: International Finance, and ECO 4223: Money and Banking.

Criteria: 1) More than seventy-five percent (75%) of seniors will earn passing grade ("C" or better) in their oral and written presentations and projects in the capstone courses (ECP 4703; ECO 4713 and ECO 4223). 2) More than ninety-percent (90%) of the Internship Supervisors will rank interns above average or excellent in their evaluation of the interns' written and oral performance on the job.

Results (Spring 07): 1) The target set is slightly missed. It was set at seventy-five (75%) but the realized performance is sixty-nine percent (69%). 2) The targets set at above 90% Internship Supervisors ranking interns above average or excellent are achieved.

Use of Results: Students will be encouraged to take ENC 1101 and ENC 1102 before taking the capstone courses that involve written and oral presentation. Students will also be encouraged to get help from the English Department's Writing Laboratory, when necessary, in order to maintain the above performance rate.
Biological and Agricultural Systems Engineering (BS) 2006-2007

**Outcome:** Critical Thinking: Students will demonstrate an ability to assimilate and critically evaluate information and concepts related to Biological and Agricultural Systems Engineering.

**Criteria:** 100% of graduates will earn a “C” grade or better the Biological and Agricultural Systems Engineering critical thinking engineering core courses: Introduction to Design Analysis (ABE 3012), Natural Resource Conservation Engineering (ABE 3212) and the two (2) Senior Design Capstone Courses (ABE 4042 and 4043). Grades are determined by constructed exams, homework and course projects. A panel consisting of the professor and (at least) one additional outside observer grades all course projects.

**Results:** Four (4) students completed the critical thinking engineering core courses: Introduction to Design Analysis (ABE 3012), Natural Resource Conservation Engineering (ABE 3212) and the two (2) Senior Design Capstone Courses (ABE 4042 and 4043). The presentations were reviewed by three (3) outside reviewers and found to be judged overall as very good to excellent (B-A). However, the written reports were judged as poor to fair (D-C).

**Use of Results:** ABE 3012 and 3212 will have addition computer programming homework and in-class assignments.

Chemistry (BS) 2007-2008

**Outcome:** Critical Thinking as measured by the ability to solve chemical problems, read, evaluate, and interpret chemical and general scientific information.

**Criteria:** All graduating seniors will have earned a mean grade of “B” or higher in the capstone seminar course.

**Results:** 83.3% of graduating seniors passed the capstone Seminar Course.

**Use of Results:** Assigned Faculty mentors to all the students enrolled in the Seminar Course. Invite outside speakers to give scientific seminars.

Criminal justice (BCJ) 2008-2009

**Outcome:** Critical Thinking Skills: Students and graduates will demonstrate the ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate criminological issues.

**Criteria:** 1) 80% of students enrolled in CCJ 4934 will earn a "C" or better. 2) 80% of students will rate their satisfaction level 3 or better.

**Results:** On average 85% of the students who registered for CCJ 4934 and CCJ 4947 successfully completed these courses. 1) CCJ 4934-Senior Seminar was offered during the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters; students were evaluated on their research, organization of a seminar and presentation of the results. Overall, evaluation of their work showed that approximately 70% earned a grade of C or better. Also, evaluation of students' performance by the audience showed that over 95% rated them satisfactorily. 2) 90% of the students enrolled in the internship during the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters received ratings ranging from “very good” to “outstanding.”

**Use of Results:** Improve coordination across pre-requisite courses to better prepare students to enter the major core courses. Explore use of common rubric across core courses of CCJ 2010, CCJ 3610, CCJ 3702, CCJ 3510, CCJ 4012 and CCJ 4700

Agricultural Science (BS) 2008-2009

**Outcome:** Communication Skills: Agricultural Science students will demonstrate proficiency in written, oral, and visual communication skills when discussing issues related to the various fields of agricultural science as appropriate for their university level.

**Criteria:** 1) In 2008 – 2009, 80% of students in the FOS 4311, ANS 4080C, and ANS 4931 courses will demonstrate proficiency in written, oral, and visual communication skills when discussing issues related to agricultural science. 2) In exit surveys graduates will indicate that they have experienced growth in their written, oral, and visual communication skills.

**Results:** 1) All students in FOS 4311, ANS 4080C, and ANS 4931 were required to display written, oral, and visual communication skills when discussing issues related to the Food and Animal Sciences. 90% of the students in these courses were recognized as being proficient in using written, oral, and visual communication skills when discussing issues related to the Food and Animal Sciences. 2) In their exit interviews 85% of graduates strongly agreed, or agreed
that during their matriculation in the Division of Agricultural Sciences they experienced growth in their ability to communicate.

**Use of Results:** The results show that students majoring in the agricultural sciences are graduating with improved communication skills whether written, oral or visual. They also show that there is room for improvement. These results show the need for the 85% of students agreeing that they had improved in their communication skills to be drawn solely from the strongly agreed cohort.

**Architectural Studies (B. Arch) 2008-2009**

**Outcome:** Communication skills: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to speak and write effectively on subject matter contained in the curriculum. (Competency derived from National Architecture Accrediting Board Student Performance Criterion #1: Verbal and Writing Skills - Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively.)

**Criteria:** 1) Successful completion of the oral and written components of the final 5th Year Design project. 2) Student performance will be periodically reviewed and evaluated by a Visiting Team assembled by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB.)

**Results:** 1) All graduating students performances were reviewed and 100% earned a grade of "C" or higher in their 5th Year Final Project. 2) The NAAB Team will make their site visit in 2010.

**Use of Results:** Students are being assigned public presentation projects in a broader array of courses earlier in the curriculum.

**Biology (MS) 2008-2009**

**Outcome:** Communication Skills: Students will demonstrate communication skills which include - reading, speaking, writing, questioning, listening, and creating.

**Criteria:** 1) All of the students will be assessed on their ability to write essays on prospecti, exams, lab reports, and thesis projects. All students will give an oral scientific presentation at least 3 times prior to graduation. Students should be able to proficiently write and present a scientific paper. 2) All of the students graduating with a M.S. in Biology will have a minimum 2.0 in all biology core classes. Surveys will be conducted annually to determine that the overall perception of the student's experience is positive.

**Results:** 1) (BSC5935/5921) 100% of students averaged 3.5/5.0 on class presentations based on a presentation rubric. No Oral Defenses in Fall 2008 Students were required to complete written lab reports, critically critique scientific literature, or research papers (BSC5935/5921). No Master's thesis in Fall 2008 One written prospectus was presented by (VB) who is actually a non-thesis candidate now. His score was 2.1/5.0 based on the written communication rubric. He has been asked to re-write it. Spring 2009 (BSC5935/5921) 96% of students averaged 3.5/5.0 on class presentations based on a presentation rubric. One Oral Defenses in Spring 2009 was successfully passed by an examining three-member thesis board All students were required to complete written lab reports, critically critique scientific literature, or research papers (BSC5935/5921). One Master's thesis in Spring 2009 was passed by (RB) a female graduate student One written prospectus was presented by (RB) who was a thesis candidate. Her score was 4.6/5.0 based on the written communication rubric. She successfully passed the exam as assessed by a three-member board. 2) Fall 2008 all graduate students maintained a 3.0 average in Fall 2008 No surveys were administered Spring 2009 No surveys were administered in Spring 2009.

**Use of Results:** Many non-thesis students have been given written encouragement to complete work due and graduate but since they are now in medical school they lack the drive to finish.

**English Teacher Education (BS) 2009-2010**

**Outcome:** Critical Thinking - Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking and analytical skills within the subject content area as well as other disciplines.

**Criteria:** 1) 75% of the graduating seniors will demonstrate a proficiency of critical thinking and analytical skills by scoring 75% or higher in 3000 and 4000 level courses. 2) 75% of graduating English majors will respond to the English Department Senior Exit Survey in order to provide feedback on student perceptions of their program experience. 3) 75% of students responding to the survey item inquiring about how often they might “Apply material learned in an English...
class to other areas, i.e. job, internship, etc or another class” will indicate “very often,” implying they are satisfied with their program experience. 

Results: 1) 80.17% of English/English Education majors demonstrate satisfactory critical thinking skills in 3000 and 4000 level courses by scoring 75% or higher on locally developed exams, essays, and presentations graded in accordance with department standards. 2) 80% of graduating English majors responded to the English Department Senior Exit Survey to provide feedback on student perceptions of their program experience. 3) 83.3% of English/English Education majors responded to the survey item inquiring about how often they might “Apply material learned in an English class to other areas, i.e. job, internship, etc or another class” indicated “very often.”

Use of Results: After a charge from the department chair, and discussion in the department meetings, the English Department Level Assessment Committee met to discuss the implementation of the Senior Project for English and English Education majors. Criteria for the Senior Project was discussed (list is available); however, decisions regarding actual implementation are still pending. The DLAC plans to present a proposal for decision by the department during the 2010-2011 school year.

Health Information Management (B.S.) 2009-2010

Outcome: Critical Thinking Skills – Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking skills about issues in the HIM profession.

Criteria: 1) 90% of graduating students will score 70% or better on the HIM 4344 Departmental Layout Project graded by faculty using an appropriate rubric designed to evaluate proficiency in critical thinking skills. 2) 90% of graduates responding to the Graduate Survey item – Enabled me to think critically, solve problems, and develop appropriate action steps – will indicate the HIM program prepared them for critical thinking on the certification examination and in professional practice with a rating of generally agree or strongly agree.

Results: 1) 100% (23/23) of students scored 70% or better on the HIM 4344 Departmental Layout Project. 2) 100% (10/10) of graduates responded with a rating of generally agree or strongly agree that the program enabled them to think critically, solve problems, and develop appropriate action steps.

Use of Results: Program faculty use results to confirm the application of knowledge being taught and improve critical thinking skills. Faculty regularly shares effective critical thinking activities and teaching techniques.

Environmental Sciences (M.S.) 2009-2010

Outcome: Communication - Students will demonstrate proficiency in the oral and written communication of environmental science and policy concepts and principles by communicating ideas about the environment, with clarity, to audiences with different levels of education or training in environmental science; and present, environmental science information in different forms, as necessary: oral, graphical, pictorial, or mathematical.

Criteria: 1) 80% of Environmental Sciences Institute (ESI) MS students will have their research prospectus approved by the end of their second year. 2) 50% of ESI MS students will submit abstracts for poster or oral presentations at local, regional, national or international scientific meetings. 3) 90% of ESI MS students will complete and successfully defend their Master’s degree theses. 4) 50% of ESI MS students will submit manuscripts for publication in peer-reviewed journals. 5) 25% of ESI MS students will have manuscripts accepted for publication in peer-reviewed literature. 6) 80% of ESI graduate students will report that they have attained multiple opportunities for improving oral and written communication upon completion of each of the ESI core courses based on course evaluations and/or course exit surveys. 7) Analysis of focus group data conducted at the end of the each academic year will report student consensus that proficiency and progression in oral and written communication were achieved since the prior academic year.

Results: 1) 50% of ESI MS students had their research prospectus approved by the end of their second year. 2) 71% of ESI MS students submitted abstracts for poster or oral presentations at local, regional, national or international scientific meetings. 3) 100% of ESI MS students, who attempted, successfully defended their Master’s degree theses in 2009-2010. 4) 11% of ESI MS students will submit manuscripts for publication in peer-reviewed journals. 5) 11% of ESI MS students had manuscripts accepted for publication in peer-reviewed literature. 6) 83% of ESI masters students reported that they have been presented with multiple opportunities for improving oral and written communication upon completion of each of the ESI core courses based on course evaluations and/or course exit surveys. 7) Analysis of
focus group data conducted at the end of each academic year reported student consensus that proficiency and progression in oral and written communication were improved since the prior academic year, but that proficiencies could be strengthened.

**Use of Results:**
1) Recommend professional development on curriculum planning in order to get new ideas on achieving balance of inclusion of written and oral communication in core courses. 2) Recommend formation of a committee to study progression of masters students to ensure program completion in a timely fashion. 3) Graduate student writing workshops are being proposed, and graduate students have been referred to the University Writing Center.

**Community Psychology (MS) 2009-2010**

**Outcome:** Communication Skills- Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in oral and in written communication about issues in the field of community psychology, specifically and discipline of psychology, generally.

**Criteria:**
1) 90% of students will complete and pass a written and oral defense of a Master's thesis or complete the graduate psychology DIS research paper requirement by the end of the second year. 2) 80% of the students will receive favorable evaluations of their oral and written communication skills by internship supervisors. 3) 90% of internship supervisors and post-graduate supervisor(s) will offer positive feedback of their perceptions of graduates' competencies in the area of communication.

**Results:**
1) 70% of students completed and passed the written and oral defense of the Master's thesis or completed the graduate psychology DIS research paper requirement by the end of the second year. 2) 80% of the students received favorable evaluations of their oral and written communication skills by internship supervisors. 3) 90% of internship supervisors and post-graduate supervisor(s) gave positive feedback of their perceptions of graduates' competencies in the area of communication.

**Use of Results:** We will continue to monitor supervisor and student /graduate perceptions of the written and oral skill sets associated with the current outcome. A rubric is being used to assess students' progress and development in this area.

**RESULTS FROM GEAC ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS**

Results of how students' writing and critical thinking skills are assessed and improved at the institutional level through the GEAC are provided below.

**General Education Pilot Portfolio (2005-2006)**

To determine the overall effectiveness of the portfolio as a direct method of assessment for the General Education program, the GEAC requested that the Department of English conduct a pilot for Communication for the 2005-2006 academic year. Twelve faculty members and 117 students enrolled in Freshman Communicative Skills I and II (ENC 1101 and ENC 1102), Foundations of Speech (SPC 1050), and Public Speaking (SPC 2600) classes participated in this study, and 318 artifacts (expository essays, literary papers, and speeches) were collected. The data collected revealed that students were being taught and evaluated on competencies identified for Communication in the GEAC plan; that over 70% of students in the pilot successfully completed the classes and that developing and using rubrics, as directed by GEAC, led to more uniformity and accuracy in evaluating both written and oral assignments.

**General Education Institutional Portfolio (2006-2007)**

**Artifact Collection** - As a result of the success of the pilot, in the Spring 2006 semester, GEAC adopted the institutional portfolio as one of two direct methods of assessment. At the outset in the fall, then-Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Debra Austin, sent a letter to all faculty members requesting their “full cooperation” in the portfolio study [7]. However, most artifacts collected were received due to hands-on interaction between GEAC members and faculty within disciplines historically charged with teaching specific competencies and GEAC members who teach courses in the General Education program. For instance, English faculty members were asked to submit artifacts for Communication and Critical Thinking, and Science faculty were asked to submit artifacts on Critical Thinking. Faculty members were asked to submit ungraded artifacts from classes with a representative sampling of
student skills levels, i.e., not the weakest nor the most advanced students. Original artifacts were returned to faculty for their evaluation of student class performance.

By the end of the spring, GEAC had received cross-discipline artifacts for each learning outcome. For the Communication outcome, play critiques were received from an Introduction to Theatre class, and essays were received from a Humanities class (Early Civilizations and the Classical World) along with expository essays and literary analyses from English classes (ENC 110l and ENC 1102). Artifacts for Critical Thinking included causal analysis papers from English classes, lab reports from General Physics, position papers written by students, case studies from Philosophy, and essays written for History examinations.

Artifact Evaluation Process - Once collected, the artifacts were copied, students' names were removed and replaced with numeric identification, and artifacts for each of the four learning outcomes assessed were distributed to Faculty Assessment Scoring Team (FAST) members. Each FAST member evaluated artifacts holistically using the scoring rubric developed by GEAC for the respective outcome. Each artifact was evaluated by two FAST members. When there was a two-point or more discrepancy between the first two evaluations, the third member of FAST for that particular outcome evaluated the artifact. The final pass or fail rating assigned to the artifact was made based on the two out of the three evaluations that were either identical or had a one-point differentiation.

**Communication Rubric Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate/Acceptable/Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three (3) is the minimum passing score an evaluator can assign each Communication artifact. An artifact that receives a 2/3 split (below average and average) does not pass. If there is a 2/4 split (below average and adequate to good), the artifact is passed to a third evaluator. Criteria for Communication artifacts include the following: thesis statement, support, language, coherence, and convention (grammar, mechanics, sentence structure, mechanics, and diction).

**Critical Thinking Rubric Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the criteria for Critical Thinking artifacts include the following: conclusions drawn, logical structure, and valid and invalid reasoning patterns. The full rubrics used for assessment can be found at [http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&AssessmentInstrumentsandInventory](http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&AssessmentInstrumentsandInventory).

Artifact Evaluation Results - In the 2006-2007 Institutional Portfolio initiative, approximately 679 artifacts were received from 17 faculty members in these eight programs: English, History, Humanities, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, and Theatre. Out of the 679 submissions, 618 were evaluated. The other 61 were not evaluated because writing was either illegible or submissions were deemed inappropriate samples for learning outcomes being assessed. Our expectation is that there would be a 70% or better passing rate per learning outcome. Critical Thinking outcome met this set criterion/expectation.
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2006-2007 Artifact Institutional Portfolio Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th># of Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Number Passing</th>
<th>% Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results suggest that students appear to demonstrate mastery of Critical Thinking competencies. These results were shared with the University community through annual assessment reports, Assessment Roundtables, and the 2007-2008 Faculty Planning Conference.

General Education Institutional Portfolio (2007-2008)  
Artifact Collection - Approximately 324 artifacts were received for the academic year. Of these 324, 73 were received for Communication, 49 for Critical Thinking, 83 for Cultural Diversity, 98 for Ethical Values, and 21 for Quantitative Reasoning. Out of the 324 artifacts received, 303 were evaluated. The 21 submissions for Quantitative Reasoning were not evaluated due to the limited number of artifacts collected. Artifacts for this portfolio consist of the following: expository papers and speeches from composition and speech classes for Communication; position papers written for philosophy classes for Critical Thinking; play critiques from theatre classes and position papers from psychology classes for Cultural Diversity; and position papers from philosophy and psychology.

2007-2008 Artifact Institutional Portfolio Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th># of Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Number Passing</th>
<th>% Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the previous year, Critical Thinking passing rate improved from 73% to 80% (a 7% score gain)

Focus Groups  
A focus group is the indirect method used to assess the General Education program. A focus group evaluation is conducted once a semester in order to discover student (1) awareness of the General Education program in general, (2) knowledge of expected learning outcomes in particular, and (3) familiarity with current assessment preparations being conducted by FAMU. The focus groups generally consist of seven to ten students from varied majors.

Focus Group Logistics 2006-2007 - During the 2006-2007 academic year three (3) focus groups were conducted. The total number of students participating for the year was 17. These students were selected by members who served on GEAC as well as other faculty members contacted by GEAC members. In many instances students volunteered, and at other times students were drafted in order to ensure diversity by classification, gender, age, race, etc. Students were not given any details about the discussion points prior to the interviews. Two faculty/staff members served as moderators, one to ask questions; the other to record responses and observe group behavior. Each focus group discussion was recorded and later transcribed. Each moderator followed guidelines/interview protocol as outlined in the Focus Group Logistics document, which included an introduction explaining the purpose of the Focus Group, questions for students related to academic concerns about the General Education program, and closing comments expressing thanks to students for their cooperation and input. The full process for conducting the focus group and specific questions asked can be found at the following link:

http://www.famu.edu/Assessment/GEAC%20Meeting%20Minutes/GEAC%20Rubrics/Focus%20Group%20Logistics%20GEAC%20(October%202006).pdf

Focus Group Responses - The following brief narrative summarizes students’ verbal responses to their experience(s) with specified communication learning outcomes in General Education courses.

- COMMUNICATION- Consensus of students was that they have/had ample opportunities to enhance communication skills in general education classes. They believe that they get enough writing, reading and oral communication assignments in their general education and major courses.
Focus Group Assessment - Overall, commentary made by students in focus groups confirmed that learning outcomes cited earlier are being addressed in General Education courses. Their responses suggest that more emphasis should be placed on these outcomes in courses. As an indirect method of assessment, the focus group does prove to have substantial merit, for comments made by participating students reflect the findings of the direct methods of assessment and reiterate the recommendations made by GEAC for enhancing the General Education program.

D. Does your university offer or require a class that focuses on the development of writing proficiency and critical thinking skills? If so, please send me the data on the success of students who enrolled in that course.

The university’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), “Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking”, focuses entirely on assessing and improving students’ writing and critical thinking skills. As parts of its main activities, the QEP has implemented learning and assessment practices in specific courses to develop students’ skills in these two learning areas.

The FAMU QEP has a specific focus on English (ENC 1101/ENC 1102) and African-American history (AMH 2091/AFA 3104) courses, which are general education courses that most FAMU students take during their freshman year. With a focus on these four (4) courses, and by using the FAMU Critical Thinking Definition and the concepts of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Revised), the FAMU QEP introduced changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment methods in order to increase the likelihood that freshman students who complete these courses will show measurable improvements in their critical thinking skills, which include the ability to:

- Gather, process and analyze information;
- Make critical judgments about the validity of information; and
- Effectively defend their positions regarding information.

Specific activities in and relating to these courses include:

- Writing critical essays; (assessed using newly developed University uniform critical thinking rubrics);
- Preparation and defense of case study analyses (assessed using newly developed University uniform critical thinking rubrics);
- Creation of a Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series; and
- Creation of a Freshman Summer Reading Program.

Faculty development is an important part of the implementation of the FAMU QEP. All University faculty, with specific emphasis on those who teach freshman students in ENC 1101/1102 and AMH 2091/AFA 3104 courses, have the opportunity to participate in a series of faculty development activities designed to improve pedagogy and assessment of critical thinking skills. Accordingly, uniform and effective critical thinking pedagogy and assessment are embedded into course curricula to assist in accomplishing the overall goal of enhancing students’ critical thinking skills, with an ultimate improvement in student learning.

At a larger scale, the university, through the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC), also assesses students’ writing proficiency and critical thinking skills in various ways including focus groups and the collection and analysis of samples of general education artifacts which include student work to demonstrate writing proficiency and critical thinking skills. The NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement), Exit, and Alumni surveys are used to collect graduating students’ and alumni views on their writing and critical thinking skills after attending the university.

Additionally, ILAC played a major role in developing institutional survey instruments such as the Exit and Alumni survey. They also provided the recommendations to the University administration to purchase and administer the NSSE.

At FAMU, the main goal of General Education assessment is to identify core competencies and implementation strategies crucial to promoting student achievement in academic, professional, and life-long pursuits. Relevant courses
to assess those outcomes (including communication and critical thinking) and competencies are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome Statement</th>
<th>Competencies Knowledge/Skills/Attitudes</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Courses Where Taught/Other Means of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who complete the General Education Core at Florida A&amp;M University will be able to: <strong>Demonstrate competence in writing, reading and speaking.</strong> <em>(Communication)</em></td>
<td>1. Write in a variety of modes (e.g., illustrations, comparison/contrast, positions, essays, critiques, and research) 2. Transmit ideas and information which conform to conventional standards of written English 3. Apply critical reading skills to a wide range of materials 4. Critically evaluate other’s messages 5. Compose spoken message suitable for audience 6. Deliver a message or presentation suitable for a particular audience 7. Use effective delivery techniques to reach an audience</td>
<td>• Written assignments (Rubric-Assessed Paragraphs, Essays, Speeches, Research Papers, Etc.) • Essays, Etc. • Oral Presentations • Quizzes • Standardized Tests • Reading Comprehension Assignments</td>
<td>• ENC 1101 &amp; 1102 Freshman Communication Skills I &amp; II • ENC 1121 &amp; 1122 Freshman Composition (Honors) • SPC 1050 Foundations of Speech • SPC 2600 Public Speaking • Humanities Courses (from approved list see 2006-2008 university catalog page 53) Student Support Services (math labs, science labs, writing labs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who complete the General Education Core at Florida A&amp;M University will be able to: <strong>Apply critical thinking to learning and real-world situations.</strong> <em>(Critical Thinking)</em></td>
<td>1. Draw conclusions after weighing evidence, facts and ideas 2. Clarify issues to resolve problems 3. Clarify unsupported claims using standards of credibility and expertise 4. Assess unsupported claims using standards of credibility and expertise 5. Utilize available information to evaluate the credibility of a source, formulate an opinion and defend it 6. Apply logical operations 7. Neutralize fallacious reasoning and rhetoric 8. Distinguish between valid and invalid patterns of reasoning 9. Analyze the logical structure of arguments 10. Perform basic analytic tasks – categorizing information, distinguishing between relevant</td>
<td>• Math Problem sets • Math Exams • Laboratory Exercises • Written assignments (Rubric-Assessed Paragraphs, Essays, Speeches, Research Papers, Etc.) • Standardized Tests</td>
<td>• ENC 1101 &amp; 1102 Freshman Communication Skills I &amp; II • ENC 1121 &amp; 1122 Freshman Composition (Honors) • MGF 1106 &amp; 1107 Liberal Arts Math I &amp; II • MAC 1105 College Algebra • PSC 1121 Intro to Phy. Sci • BSC 1005L Biological Science Lab, BSC 1010L &amp; 1011L • General Biology Labs I &amp; II • CHM 1045L &amp; 1046L General Chemistry Labs I &amp; II • AMH 2091 Intro to African American History • AFA 3104 The African American Experience • Humanities Courses (from approved list see 2006-2008 university catalog page 53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available results on the development of writing proficiency and critical thinking skills are provided in Response C. Additional institutional level assessment results are provided in the following sections.

RESULTS FROM THE EXIT SURVEY
FAMU’s Exit Survey is designed to collect information from graduating seniors regarding their perceptions and experiences as students. This 117 response-item survey targets student opinions about the following: student support services, facilities, departments, availability of services, program assessment, major field of study, collegiate experience and future plans. This survey is administered at the end of each semester incorporates seniors opinions about their being equipped to communicate effectively and to think critically while solving problems. The results of the last five (5) years presented in the chart below indicate that between 93% and 96% graduating students who responded are satisfied with their communication and critical thinking skills after attending the University.
RESULTS FROM THE ALUMNI SURVEY
FAMU’s Alumni Survey is designed to collect information regarding employment status, continued education, and satisfaction with the University. This 28-item survey developed in 2006-2007 academic year is administered online every 3 years. The available results presented in the table below show that most respondents, between 91% and 96%, are “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with their communication and critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS</th>
<th>Very Satisfied or Somewhat Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving problems</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making connection between classes I have taken and other life experiences</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing effectively</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking effectively</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE) SURVEY
NSSE is a standardized national survey with 85 response items designed to answer the fundamental question: Are educational practices and curricula producing desirable learning outcomes? It provides information about students’ perceptions related to: what students actually do in college, and what they are learning. The goal is to use this information to improve the educational experience of students.
NSSE is administered every 3 years since 2005. The available results shown in the table below indicate that, FAMU seniors rated their communication and critical thinking skills about same or higher than senior students from peer institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable Opinions of Senior Students</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMU</td>
<td>PEERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = none, 2 = between 1 and 4, 3 = between 4 and 10, 4 = between 11 and 20, 5 = more than 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3c: Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3d: Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3e: Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?</strong> 1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11c: Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11e: Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Are professors required to integrate writing proficiency and critical thinking into all courses? If so, what oversight is provided to ensure that these skills are being taught? How are these skills integrated into course assessments?

Under the OUA oversight, each department or program, supported by the college/school assessment committees, is expected to conduct evaluation and review processes sufficient to corroborate that the assessments in the Academic Learning Compact measure student achievement on each of the expected learning outcomes. All evaluation and
review processes are consistent with the Guidelines for ALCs. The ALCs evaluation results are documented and made an integral part of the Annual Institutional Assessment Report prepared by the OUA.

The OUA provides guidance to programs and monitors implementation of the ALCs in courses by requiring programs to include ALCs in undergraduate course syllabi, and collecting and reviewing samples of syllabi for compliance from academic programs each fall semester.

The following has been set forth in the BOT approved FAMU ALC Policies and Procedures.

III. Academic Learning Compact Evaluation Process

For all baccalaureate programs on (or that an institution intends to place on) the State University System Academic Degree Inventory:

a. Program faculty must develop Academic Learning Compacts that identify, at a minimum, the expected core student learning outcomes for program graduates in the areas of (i) content/discipline knowledge and skills; (ii) communication skills; and (iii) critical thinking skills. Input should be sought from the business and professional community to identify learning outcomes that students need for success in the global marketplace and society.

b. Program faculty must identify the corresponding assessment tools and procedures that faculty use within the context of the program to determine if individual students have met each of the articulated core student learning expectations.

c. University personnel must develop robust and effective program assessment/evaluation systems (which can involve sampling), including external corroboration, to substantiate that graduates have truly attained the expected core competencies. Such program assessments/evaluations should provide assurance that completion of the baccalaureate degree program indicates that individual students have attained the articulated core learning requirements.

d. Program faculty must demonstrate the use of results from program assessments/evaluations to continuously improve program effectiveness and student learning.

The University requires each program to develop evaluation systems, including external validations, necessary to corroborate the identified assessment strategies to measure student achievement on the expected student learning outcomes. The validations include:

a. Reviews of the Academic Learning Compacts and related results by teams of faculty;

b. Oversight of program assessment and improvement systems by the ILAC and GEAC Committees and the Office of Assessment; and

c. Program reviews or specialized accreditation processes - External consultants will review the learning outcomes to verify they are appropriate for the discipline, methods of assessment, and samples of student work.

Such evaluations will serve to validate the confidence levels associated with the assessment mechanisms used in the program.

The Office of Assessment shall be the repository for all Academic Learning Compacts and assessment plans in the University. In addition:

1. Each program department is required to keep complete records of its Academic Learning Compacts and assessment plans.

2. The executive summary for the Academic Learning Compacts and measurements of student achievement in each program must be submitted to the appropriate Dean’s office.

3. The Director for Assessment will ensure that these Academic Learning Compacts and assessment plans are made available to ILAC.

4. The ILAC will review the submitted assessment reports against plans that were previously submitted by the instructional programs and make recommendations for revisions, as appropriate.

5. The ILAC will corroborate, through appropriate methods, that the reported results have been used for implementing programmatic or service improvements.

6. The ALC’s evaluation findings will be made an integral part of the Annual Institutional Assessment Report prepared by the Office of Assessment.

IV. The Availability of Academic Learning Compacts to Students

The University is responsible for providing all of its prospective and current students with clearly defined Academic Learning Compacts, which are written in a user-friendly format. Academic programs will distribute their Academic
Learning Compacts to students through the University website and course syllabi. Effective Fall Semester 2005, these Compacts will be made available to all prospective and current students of the University. In addition:

b. Program faculty must provide current and prospective students with student-friendly, jargon-free Academic Learning Compacts for each baccalaureate program on (or that an institution intends to place on) the State University System Academic Degree Inventory. Each Academic Learning Compact must be made available on the university’s Web site and must include, at a minimum:
   i. concise statements of what active and successful students participating in the joint teaching-learning-assessment process will know and be able to do, expressed in terms of the core student learning outcomes embodied in the requirements for each baccalaureate degree;
   ii. A list of the types of assessments students might encounter in the program (e.g., capstone projects, juried performances, standardized exams, common embedded exam questions, portfolio requirements, etc.).

F. Do you have measurable goals for student success after graduation? If so, please send me the goals and he results for the last five to ten years.

A summary of results on preparation for career and success after graduation from the Exit Survey and Alumni Survey are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 Alumni Survey Results</th>
<th>Very Satisfied or Somewhat Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the way FAMU prepared you for your current job?</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the way FAMU prepared you for your first job after graduation?</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your current job?</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the way FAMU prepared you for the additional college work?</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being prepared for further education</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit Surveys
Graduating Students Satisfaction Rates for Selected Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already accepted a job offer</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very confident</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not confident at all.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Please provide me with any additional information you think may be helpful, including your thought process to make sure we are headed in the right direction.

1. Through exposure and involvement in national dialogues on student learning outcomes assessment, OUA stays abreast of current trends and national initiatives such as the LEAP campaign and AAC&U VALUE Initiative. As a result several emergent outcomes, such as Personal and Social Responsibility encompassing such competencies as sustainability, ethical values and financial literacy, identified to be essential for students to obtain during their matriculation through college are now being infused into the university’s core curriculum.