2017 - 2018
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down.
If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

Select Program or Type in Below

OR enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. **Critical Thinking**
- ☐ 2. **Information Literacy**
- ☐ 3. **Written Communication**
- ☐ 4. **Oral Communication**
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- ☑ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☑ 9. Team Work
- ☑ 10. Problem Solving
- ☑ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- ☑ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☑ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- ☑ 19. **Professionalism**
- ☐ 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. [_____]

b. [_____]

c. [_____]

- ☐ 20B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs**. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

As part of the annual accreditation update, the department reviewed three of the accreditation objectives:

1. Students will be able to development of outcome-oriented goals and objectives.
   - PLOs: 16, 18
   - BLGs: Competence in the Disciplines, Intellectual and Practical Skills
   - *This is a foundation of Management by Objectives, which is one of the management techniques taught to students in RPTA.*
2. Plan, implement and evaluate a community event in a small group.
   - PLOs: 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19
   - BLGs: Competence in the Disciplines, Intellectual and Practical Skills, Personal and Social Responsibility, Integrative Learning
   - *Non-Profit oriented leadership and fundraising is a skill required of all RPTA majors. Selecting a non-profit agency to partner with, creating and coordinating an event to raise money, administering the event and evaluating its success/failure are key components of the Rec Admin degree.*
3. Students will be able to describe the basic elements of a supervisor/administrator's responsibilities and differentiate between the various management, supervisory and administrative styles.
   - PLOs: 1, 18, 19
   - BLGs: Competence in the Disciplines, Intellectual and Practical Skills
   - *Appropriate for all levels of management across the range of sub-fields in RPTA. The critical thinking component involves making and supporting management style decision on a given set of criteria to produce a desired outcome*

Q1.2.1.
Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?
- ○ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ● 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ○ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ○ 4. N/A
- ○ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.
Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?
- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.
Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?
- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- 🔘 1. Yes
- ⭕ 2. No
- ⭕ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.

Did your program use the **Degree Qualification Profile** ("DQP", see http://degreeprofile.org) to develop your PLO(s)?

- ⭕ 1. Yes
- 🔵 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- ⭕ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- ⭕ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- 🔘 1. Yes
- ⭕ 2. No
- ⭕ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the **correct box*** for this PLO in Q1.1):

Integrative and Applied Learning

If your PLO is **not listed, please enter it here**:

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Each semester RPTA 136: Program and Event Planning raise between $10,000-$15,000 for non-profit (or government or tax-supported) agencies in the Sacramento region. This is a core course for all RPTA majors, regardless of concentration. Students work in teams of two and are required to select an agency, work with the agency to plan, market and administer a fundraising event, and then evaluate the event's success/failure. This is a course taken by seniors in the program and it incorporates several PLOs. Because the assignment is real-life and not hypothetical, it is one of the most appropriate assignments to meet the PLO of Integrative and Applied Learning.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit program standards of performance/expectations** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

- 🔵 1. Yes

    ◯ 2. No
    ◯ 3. Don't know
    ◯ 4. N/A

Q2.3.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

> The Student Evaluation shows the points possible for different components of the final project. This file also shows the form for the narrative evaluation the instructor gives students on various components of the program.
>
> The second attachment includes other evaluations that are completed for the project by students and the partnering agency. Please see the Table of Contents for a list of what is contained in this attachment. (Note that the budget is an example and that students do not pay for their projects. Part of their work during the semester is to get items/marketing/space donated - but they need a budget in order to begin this task. Also, the Evaluation of Participants is not included in the manual as students will develop these based on their program and the agency's expected outcomes.)

📎 Progamming Manual _Student Evaluation.pdf 79.38 KB	📎 Progamming Manual Spring 2018-PN.pdf 98.93 KB

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard (stdrd)** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☑	☑	☑	1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☑	☐	☑	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
☐	☐	☐	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☐	☐	☐	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
☐	☐	☐	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
☐	☐	☐	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
☐	☐	☐	10. Other, specify:

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?
    🔘 1. Yes
    ◯ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
    ◯ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
    ◯ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

`1`

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?
- 🔘 1. Yes
- ⚪ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ⚪ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ⚪ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

The data was collected in RPTA 136: Program and Event Planning. There are two sections of this course each semester.

Students submit a final portfolio or their program/event - one per student (although there are two students working on each event).

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?
- 🔘 1. Yes
- ⚪ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- ⚪ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.
Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used? [**Check all that apply**]
- ☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☑ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☑ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work,

student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

> The grading sheets are not formal rubrics, but they do provide a great deal of detail between the points and narratives given to students. The PLO of Integrated and Applied Learning is assessed by not only the insturctor, but also the agency. (The agency evaluation can be found on pp. 37-38 of the second attachment for Q2.3.)

📎 **Progamming Manual _Student Evaluation.pdf**
79.38 KB | 📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?
- 🔘 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ⚪ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ⚪ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ⚪ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ⚪ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ⚪ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ⚪ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]
- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:

(skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?
- ⚪ 1. Yes
- ⚪ 2. No
- ⚪ 3. Don't know
- ⚪ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?
- ⚪ 1. Yes
- ⚪ 2. No
- ⚪ 3. Don't know
- ⚪ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?
- 🔘 1. Yes
- ⚪ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know
○ 4. N/A

Q3.5.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

| 1 |

Q3.5.1.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

| 1 |

Q3.5.2.
If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?
○ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know
● 4. N/A

Q3.6.
How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

All students are required to turn in the assignment.

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

All submitted projects were graded.

Recreation Therapy makes up about 42% of the total number given below.

Q3.6.2.
Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?

| 140 |

Q3.6.3.
Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?

140

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- ☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- ☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

[ ]

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

[ ]

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, please enter the response rate:

[ ]

Question 3C: Other Measures
(external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.
Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify:

[ ]

Q3.8.2.
Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
│                                                                       │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

(Remember: Save your progress)

┌───┐
│   Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions   │
└───┘

Q4.1.

Please provide tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our Feedback Packet Example):

In allignment with our accreditation, 70% of students should complete the Learning Outcome of *Plan, implement and evaluate a communt event in a small group.* Of the 140 students that took RPTA 136 in the 2017-2018 year, 12 did not meet the 70% mark. For the year, 91.4% of the students scored 70% or higher on the project, although not all on their first attempt. Eight students in the spring courses were taking the course for the second time.

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? **If not**, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Recreation Therapy students perform well. This is a core class, required by all students. Students that do not pass the final project must repeat the course until successful.

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 🔘 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- ⚪ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ⚪ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ⚪ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ⚪ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified

◯ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

🔘 1. Yes
◯ 2. No
◯ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

🔘 1. Yes
◯ 2. No
◯ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate ***making any changes*** for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

◯ 1. Yes
🔘 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
◯ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.
Please describe ***what changes*** you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

Q5.1.2.
Do you have a plan to assess the ***impact of the changes*** that you anticipate making?

◯ 1. Yes, describe your plan:

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	○	○	●	○	○
2. Modifying curriculum	○	○	●	○	○
3. Improving advising and mentoring	○	○	○	●	○
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	○	○	○	●	○
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	○	○	○	●	○
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	○	○	○	●	○
7. Annual assessment reports	○	●	○	○	○
8. Program review	○	○	○	○	●
9. Prospective student and family information	○	○	○	●	○
10. Alumni communication	○	○	○	●	○
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	○	○	○	○	●
12. Program accreditation	●	○	○	○	○
13. External accountability reporting requirement	○	○	○	○	●
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	○	○	○	○	●
15. Strategic planning	○	○	○	○	●
16. Institutional benchmarking	○	○	○	○	●
17. Academic policy development or modifications	○	○	●	○	○
18. Institutional improvement	○	○	○	○	●
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	○	○	○	●	○
20. New faculty hiring	○	○	○	●	○
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	○	○	●	○	○
22. Recruitment of new students	○	○	●	○	○
23. Other, specify:	○	○	○	○	●

Q5.2.1.
Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

Although Recreation Therapy shares this course with Recreation and Park Management, the data is used different. Faculty to teach this course are related to the Recreation and Park Management Concentration, therefore it does not affect new faculty hiring requests for Recreation Thereapy. However, there are aspects of programming in courses specific to the Recreation Therapy Concentration, which affects how those courses are taught based on what students have gained from RPTA 136.

Q5.3. To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	○	○	◉	○	○
2. Standards of Performance	○	○	◉	○	○
3. Measures	○	○	◉	○	○
4. Rubrics	○	○	◉	○	○
5. Alignment	○	○	◉	○	○
6. Data Collection	○	○	◉	○	○
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	○	◉	○	○
8. Use of Assessment Data	○	○	◉	○	○
9. Other, please specify:	○	○	○	○	◉

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

The feedback is generally helpful - it's more a matter of having the time to make the desired changes.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.
If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

N/A

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q6.1.
Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

N/A

Q7.
What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]
- [ ] 1. **Critical Thinking**
- [ ] 2. **Information Literacy**
- [ ] 3. **Written Communication**
- [ ] 4. **Oral Communication**
- [x] 5. Quantitative Literacy
- [ ] 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- [ ] 7. Creative Thinking
- [ ] 8. Reading
- [ ] 9. Team Work
- [ ] 10. Problem Solving
- [ ] 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- [ ] 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- [ ] 13. Ethical Reasoning
- [ ] 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- [ ] 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- [ ] 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- [ ] 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- [ ] 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- [ ] 19. **Professionalism**
- [ ] 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

Q8.
Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

Recreation Therapy reviewed the same PLO as Recreation and Park Management, which is not the norm. It did help to have both concentrations using the same assignment for review and the department plans to align the review of RT and RPM again next year.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |
| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

Q9.1.
If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

Q10.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]

BS Parks & Rec. - Rec. Therapy

Q11.
Report Author(s):

Greg Shaw

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Greg Shaw

Q11.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

Lisa Easterla and Jamie Hoffman (for RT)

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

Recreation Parks and Tourism

Q13.
College:
College of Health & Human Services

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):
366

Q15.
Program Type:
- 🔘 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ⚪ 2. Credential
- ⚪ 3. Master's Degree
- ⚪ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ⚪ 5. Other, specify:

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?
1

Q16.1. List all the names:

BS in Recreation Administration

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?
2

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?
1

Q17.1. List all the names:

MS in Recreation Administration

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?
0

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?
0

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

| 0 |

Q19.1. List all the names:

When was your **Assessment Plan**...	1. Before 2012-13	2. 2013-14	3. 2014-15	4. 2015-16	5. 2016-17	6. 2017-18	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q20. Developed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○
Q20.1. Last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

  📎 **No file attached**

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**
- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

  📎 No file attached

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?
- ● 1. Yes, specify:

| |

- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?
- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: **Save your progress**)
Save When Completed!

ver. 10.**31**.17

RPTA 136 GRADE SHEET - PROGRAM MANUAL

PLEASE INCLUDE THIS AS YOUR FIRST PAGE OF YOUR NOTEBOOK

	Assignment	Points Possible	Points Received
Preparation			
	Agency-Student Agreement	5	
	Co-Manager Contract	5	
	Facility/Site Analysis	10	
Planning	Program Description	10	
	Statement of Purpose, Goals & Objectives	10	
	Agency Policies and Procedures	10	
	Program Calendar and/or Timeline	10	
	Job Description for Program Managers	10	
	Flyer	10	
	Budget Outline	20	
Implementation	Session Plans/Weekly Meeting Minutes and Agenda (8 X 5 pts. /each)	40	

	Evaluation of Sessions/Events
	• Session Evaluations (8 X 5 pts. /each) <u>or</u>
	• Event Evaluation
	    ○ By Co-Managers (25 pts.)
	    ○ By Event Participants (15 pts.)
		40	

	Participant/Roster Attendance	5	
	Visitation reports from classmates	---	
Evaluation	Co-Manager Evaluation	10	
	Final Program Report (oral & written)	50	
	Agency Evaluation of Co-Managers	10	
	Program Information Sheet	10	
	Evaluation of Agency Supervisor	10	
	All other supporting documents (photos, receipts, lists, etc.)	35	
Follow-Up	Grade Sheet for Program Manual	---	
	Overall Program Evaluation	---	
	Class Grade Sheet	---	
	Overall Manual Neatness and Creativity	25	
	Manual Completeness	15	
	Total	**350**	

** Include this sheet in the manual for final grading.

OVERRALL PROGRAM EVALUATION

(This form is to be completed by the instructor.)

At the conclusion of the semester, your program and your performance in creating and implementing the program, will be evaluated by the instructor on the following criteria: (Each criterion is weighted at 5 points possible.)

- **Quality of program -** To what extent did co-managers strive for excellence?

- **Communication with agency supervisor and instructor** - Was communication consistent and informative? Were the agency supervisor and the instructor apprised of the progress of the program?

- **Communication with co-manager -** Was communication among the co-managers effective and efficient? How well did they communicate with their volunteer staff?

- **Creativity/resourcefulness -** Did programming sessions reflect ingenuity and creativity? To what extent did co-managers use a variety of resources?

- **Professionalism -** Did co-managers display professionalism and maturity among their participants, agency supervisor, and instructor?

- **Organization -** Were co-managers prepared and organized for each of their responsibilities (meetings, programming sessions, etc.)?

- **Adaptability -** Were co-managers able to be flexible and alter program sessions according to changes in interest of participants, weather, # of participants, etc.?

- **Time management** - Were assignments, responsibilities, and meetings conducted in a timely manner?

- **Attitude -** Did the co-managers exemplify a positive, professional, attitude throughout their program?

This evaluation is based on assignments, meetings with the instructor, and feedback from the agency supervisor.

RPTA 136 TABLE OF CONTENTS