

II. Dissemination and VI. Uses of Evaluation/Assessment Results and Actions Taken

These results are shared with faculty at Program faculty meetings as well as posted in the Program's Blackboard Organization. All program revisions that have been implemented were developed by individual faculty or program subcommittees and brought before the faculty for review and endorsement before being implemented. Specific examples are listed below.

Assessment Result	Program Revision
<p><i>Having used the Apprenticeship Report and associated scoring rubric as the primary method for assessing students' first-year research experience, our Assessment subcommittee reviewed the apprenticeship reports from the past two years. It became clear that the breadth of student experiences was not being captured; that most students engaged in a variety of activities rather than ONE project, per se, and that the requirement may be better characterized as an apprenticeship EXPERIENCE rather than an apprenticeship project.</i></p>	<p>We developed a new instrument to evaluate the Apprenticeship Experience with versions for both students and mentors. Rather than an apprenticeship report, students complete an Apprenticeship Evaluation, which includes a checklist of skills and activities, a brief reflective narrative, and requires students to submit copies of any concrete work products. Each first year student submits this evaluation along with his or her Student Activity Summary for the year and performance is reviewed with his or her advisor when they meet to discuss the Activity Summary. (see below)</p>
<p><i>Data received from CGOP (e.g., average credits completed per semester, average number of semester to graduate, etc.) highlighted the fact that we routinely had a small number of students who failed to meet the Program's standards for timely progress. The Steering Committee discussed the impact that this has on our program and concluded that this has created an undue burden on program resources, including faculty time.</i></p> <p><i>Although expectations for students' timely progress were specified in the program Handbook, there were no clear consequences for failing to meet those expectations.</i></p>	<p>The Steering Committee developed a proposal to include clear consequences for failing to meet certain program guidelines. These were discussed by the faculty, revised based on feedback. A version of the policy was approved by the faculty on October 2006 and implemented for the year. A final revision was approved by program faculty in April 2007 for implementation next year. (see below)</p>