

Ph.D. in Human Ecology
Specialization in Personal Financial Planning
Degree Program
Assessment of Student Learning Plan
Kansas State University

A. College, Department, and Date

College: *College of Human Ecology*
Department: *School of Family Studies & Human Services: Personal Financial Planning*
Date: *April 22, 2008*

B. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plans

John Grable, Professor, Personal Financial Planning

C. Degree Program

Ph.D. in Personal Financial Planning, College of Human Ecology

D. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan

1. Student Learning Outcome(s)

a. List (or attach a list) all of the student learning outcomes for the program.

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of:

- i. The fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live.
- ii. The standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.
- iii. Empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research.
- iv. How financial planning is shaped by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.

b. Identify outcomes that will be assessed in the first three years of the plan.

The unit will focus on the learning outcomes, as listed above, in accordance with the graduate student learning outcomes' project in the initial three-year-assessment plan.

Special rationale for selecting these learning outcomes:

These four learning outcomes were selected because they best match standards for student achievement currently being focused on by our program registration organizations – Certified

Financial Planner Board of Standards, International Association of Registered Financial Consultants, and Association for Financial Counseling and Planning Education.

Relationship to K-State Student Learning Outcomes:

Program SLOs	University-wide SLOs (Graduate Programs)			Program SLO is conceptually different from university SLOs
	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes and Professional Conduct	
1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.	X		X	
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live.	X	X		
3. Empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research.	X	X		
4. How financial planning is shaped by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.	X			

2. How will the learning outcomes be assessed? What groups will be included in the assessment?

See attached “Form for Identifying Strategies & Procedures for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)”

Also see:

- Appendix A: Preliminary Examination Assessment Rubric
- Appendix B: Ph.D. Dissertation Assessment Rubric

3. When will these outcomes be assessed? When and in what format will the results of the assessment be discussed?

See attached “Form for Identifying Strategies & Procedures for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)”

4. What is the unit’s process for using assessment results to improve student learning?

See attached “Form for Identifying Strategies & Procedures for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)”

Form for Identifying Strategies & Processes for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)

[*A copy of this form is available on the Assessment and Program Review web site
(www.k-state.edu/apr) under the "Updated Assessment Resources" link.]

Title of Academic Program: Personal Financial Planning **Department / Unit:** School of Family Studies & Human Services

Type of Degree: Certificate Associates Bachelor's Masters Doctoral Other: _____

Student Learning Outcome (for this page): **Students will demonstrate an understanding of the fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live.**

¹"HOW" will this learning outcome be assessed?	"WHEN" will this outcome be assessed? "WHEN" will faculty discuss the results of the assessment(s)?	²"WHAT" are your plan(s) for improving students learning for this learning outcome?
<p>The submission of a student's preliminary examination and dissertation will be used as outcome assessments for this learning outcome.</p> <p>See attached rubrics (Appendix A & B) for evaluating a Personal Financial Planning preliminary examination and Ph.D. Dissertation.</p>	<p>Preliminary examination assessment is expected to begin in 2011.</p> <p>Dissertation assessment is expected to begin in 2013-2014 when the first cohort of students finishes course and research work.</p> <p>Results of student performance on preliminary examinations will be discussed by the PFP graduate faculty at the first faculty meeting of the semester (Fall, Spring, and Summer). Graduate faculty will decide on changes in the examination process and program at curriculum meetings based on these discussions.</p>	<p>Personal Financial Planning faculty will evaluate learning performance using outcome rubrics to determine whether greater emphasis or more effective program plans are needed in this area. Strategies implemented to improve student learning outcomes in this area, if needed, will be initiated after the first series of preliminary examination and dissertations have been completed.</p>

¹There is an expectation that approximately half of the assessment methods will be direct measures of student learning.

² Briefly describe your plan for using assessment data to improve students' learning.

Preliminary Status

If a learning outcome or assessment method is preliminary (e.g., unsure or still under development), then briefly describe what and/or when you anticipate it being submitted in a more complete form.

Form for Identifying Strategies & Processes for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)

[*A copy of this form is available on the Assessment and Program Review web site
(www.k-state.edu/apr) under the "Updated Assessment Resources" link.]

Title of Academic Program: Personal Financial Planning **Department / Unit:** School of FSHS

Type of Degree: Certificate Associates Bachelor's Masters Doctoral Other: _____

Student Learning Outcome (for this page): **Students will demonstrate knowledge of standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the *Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility* developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.**

¹"HOW" will this learning outcome be assessed?	"WHEN" will this outcome be assessed? "WHEN" will faculty discuss the results of the assessment(s)?	²"WHAT" are your plan(s) for improving students learning for this learning outcome?
<p>All students will be required to complete a CFP® style standardized examination over the profession's Code of Ethics and Responsibilities developed by the CFP Board of Standards.</p>	<p>Each semester, beginning Summer 2010, in the course FSHS 836, students will be required to review the Code of Ethics and Professional Standards and given a case study to use in applying the principles from the code. An exam will be given to confirm that students have the skills necessary to apply the principles learned.</p> <p>Students are expected to receive a minimum passing score of 70%, which is equivalent to the national CFP® ethics requirement.</p> <p>Results of student performance on the standardized ethics examination will be discussed by the PFP faculty at the first faculty meeting of the semester (Fall, Spring, and Summer). Graduate faculty will decide on changes in the curriculum, process of assessment, and program changes needed to improve and/or enhance this outcome.</p>	<p>Assessment data will guide faculty in determining whether or not the principles are adequately covered in the curriculum.</p> <p>At this time, since we have no data indicating improvement is needed, our plans for change are not yet determined.</p> <p>However, it is anticipated that students will exhibit an advanced mastery of ethical issues related to the practice and theory of personal financial planning.</p>

¹There is an expectation that approximately half of the assessment methods will be direct measures of student learning.

² Briefly describe your plan for using assessment data to improve students' learning.

Preliminary Status

If a learning outcome or assessment method is preliminary (e.g., unsure or still under development), then briefly describe what and/or when you anticipate it being submitted in a more complete form.

**Form for Identifying Strategies & Processes for the
Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)**

[*A copy of this form is available on the Assessment and Program Review web site
(www.k-state.edu/apr) under the "Updated Assessment Resources" link.]

Title of Academic Program: Personal Financial Planning **Department / Unit:** School of Family Studies & Human Services

Type of Degree: Certificate Associates Bachelor's Masters Doctoral Other: _____

Student Learning Outcome (for this page): Students will demonstrate an understanding of empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research.

¹"HOW" will this learning outcome be assessed?	"WHEN" will this outcome be assessed? "WHEN" will faculty discuss the results of the assessment(s)?	²"WHAT" are your plan(s) for improving students learning for this learning outcome?
<p>The submission of a student's preliminary examination and dissertation will be used as outcome assessments for this learning outcome.</p> <p>See attached rubrics (Appendix A & B) for evaluating a Personal Financial Planning preliminary examination and Ph.D. Dissertation.</p>	<p>Preliminary examination assessment is expected to begin in 2011.</p> <p>Dissertation assessment is expected to begin in 2013-2014 when the first cohort of students finishes course and research work.</p> <p>Results of student performance on preliminary examinations will be discussed by the PFP graduate faculty at the first faculty meeting of the semester (Fall, Spring, and Summer). Graduate faculty will decide on changes in the examination process and program at curriculum meetings based on these discussions.</p>	<p>Personal Financial Planning faculty will evaluate learning performance using outcome rubrics to determine whether greater emphasis or more effective program plans are needed in this area. Strategies implemented to improve student learning outcomes in this area, if needed, will be initiated after the first series of preliminary examination and dissertations have been completed.</p>

¹There is an expectation that approximately half of the assessment methods will be direct measures of student learning.

²Briefly describe your plan for using assessment data to improve students' learning.

Preliminary Status

If a learning outcome or assessment method is preliminary (e.g., unsure or still under development), then briefly describe what and/or when you anticipate it being submitted in a more complete form.

Form for Identifying Strategies & Processes for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcome(s)

[*A copy of this form is available on the Assessment and Program Review web site
(www.k-state.edu/apr) under the "Updated Assessment Resources" link.]

Title of Academic Program: Personal Financial Planning **Department / Unit:** School of Family Studies & Human Services

Type of Degree: Certificate Associates Bachelor's Masters Doctoral Other: _____

Student Learning Outcome (for this page): **Students will demonstrate an understanding of how financial planning is shaped by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.**

¹"HOW" will this learning outcome be assessed?	"WHEN" will this outcome be assessed? "WHEN" will faculty discuss the results of the assessment(s)?	²"WHAT" are your plan(s) for improving students learning for this learning outcome?
<p>Students will enroll in rotating topic seminars (Readings in Family Studies and Human Services) during summer residency sessions. Direct measures (i.e., scores) will be based on seminar presentations and reaction papers. Indirect measures will include student self-reports of learning at the end of each seminar, as well as preliminary examination performance when appropriate.</p> <p>In addition, the submission of a student's dissertation will be used as an outcome assessment. See attached Rubric for Evaluating a Personal Financial Planning Ph.D. Dissertation (Appendix B).</p>	<p>This outcome will be assessed beginning Summer/Fall 2009.</p> <p>Students are expected to receive a minimum passing score of 80% on this topic. Baseline date will be monitored annually prior to summer residency – 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. Implementation of improvement strategies will be evaluated beginning in 2010. Dissertation assessment is expected to begin in 2013-2014 when the first cohort of students finishes course and research work.</p> <p>Results of student performance in the readings courses and on the dissertation will be discussed by the PFP faculty at the first faculty meeting of the semester (Fall, Spring, and Summer). Graduate faculty will decide on changes in the curriculum, process of assessment, and program changes needed to improve and/or enhance this outcome.</p>	<p>Because these rotating readings courses will be offered on a per-summer basis, it will be possible to begin data collection and evaluation with the first Ph.D. cohort. Personal Financial Planning faculty will evaluate learning performance on indicators to determine whether greater emphasis or more effective program plans are needed in this area. Strategies implemented to improve student learning outcomes in this area, if needed, will be initiated in 2010 and evaluated prior to subsequent summer sessions.</p>

¹There is an expectation that approximately half of the assessment methods will be direct measures of student learning.

² Briefly describe your plan for using assessment data to improve students' learning.

Preliminary Status

If a learning outcome or assessment method is preliminary (e.g., unsure or still under development), then briefly describe what and/or when you anticipate it being submitted in a more complete form.

APPENDIX A

Personal Financial Planning Preliminary Examination Assessment Response Sheet

(One for each committee member - circle response and return directly and confidentially to the student's advisor or the Chair of the Personal Financial Planning Graduate Committee)

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Very Deficient</i>	<i>Somewhat Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence structure, language and style deficient. • Major revisions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is weak. • A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors. • A number of changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile). • Limited number of typos (grammatical and spelling errors). • Some normal changes necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well written. • Easy to read and understand. • Very few changes or additions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reads like a well-polished publication. • No typos, grammatical, or spelling errors. • No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.
Quality of Question Answers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of preliminary examinations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th of preliminary examinations) • Extensions possible, but may require more work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among 10th to 25th percentile of preliminary examinations • Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among top 10% of preliminary examinations. • Student will be able to further extend; • Solid basis

					for funded projects.
Quality of Literature Review/Answer(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of preliminary examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 10th to 25th percentile of preliminary examinations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among top 10% of preliminary examinations.
Quality of Methods Review/Answer(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of preliminary examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 10th to 25th percentile of preliminary examinations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among top 10% of preliminary examinations.
Quality of Application Review/Answer(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of preliminary examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable (25th to 75th of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 10th to 25th percentile of preliminary examinations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among top 10% of preliminary examinations.
Mastery of knowledge and expertise in topic area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires committee to stretch to find student's mastery of topics. Closer to MS answers than Ph.D. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes knowledge of literature and topics to some degree; In total, lacks clarity in addressing examination questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates originality. Makes adequate description of the literature and research. Introduces new methodology, techniques, and/or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very original work; Thoughtful and thorough review of the literature. Mastery of methodological issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original and creative. Mastery of methodological and theoretical issues.

	preliminary examination.		approaches to question answers.		
Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized. • Disjointed presentation. • Unable to answer a number of questions. • Slides and handouts of very poor quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well organized. • Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects. • Had difficulty with questions. • Some slides and handouts difficult to read. • Typos and other errors on slides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable – slides and handouts clear. • Good presentation skills. • Able to answer most questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well though out slides and handouts. • Professional presentation. • Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized and very professional. • All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. • Slides and handouts outstanding.
Mastery of Learning Outcomes ✓ The fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live. ✓ The standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the Code of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of preliminary examinations . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of preliminary examinations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th of preliminary examinations) • Additional mastery of outcomes will require additional work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among 10th to 25th percentile of preliminary examinations • Opportunities for additional mastery apparent, but overall, well done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among top 10% of preliminary examinations. • Student exemplifies mastery of outcomes

<p>Ethics and Professional Responsibility developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.</p> <p>✓ Empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research.</p> <p>✓ How financial planning is shaped by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.</p>					
<p>Other -- explain</p>					

Comments and reasons for any deficiencies:

Appendix B

Rubric for Evaluating a Personal Financial Planning Ph.D. Dissertation

(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)

(Version April 2008)

Student Date of Defense:

Advisor:

Dissertation Title:

Committee Members and Department:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

- ✓ At the conclusion of the defense, **each committee member should fill out the response sheet**. For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. Since completed forms are to be treated as **confidential**, they are to be **turned in to the Committee Chair (advisor)**, not the student.
- ✓ This document should be completed, even if the committee feels that the dissertation is unacceptable.
- ✓ A copy of the dissertation abstract and conclusions, as well as copies of all journal publications or referred conference proceedings that have already resulted from the dissertation work, must accompany this evaluation form. All materials must be sent to Dr. John Grable, Chair of the Personal Financial Planning Graduate Committee, 318 Justin Hall.
- ✓ Student has accepted a position at or will continue on for a PhD at _____ (if student has yet to accept a position, please leave blank). Indicate whether student has or intends to apply (___ yes ___ no) and/or has been accepted (___ yes ___ no) to a PhD program.

Ph.D. Dissertation Response Sheet

(One for each committee member - circle response and return directly and confidentially to the student's advisor or the Chair of the Personal Financial Planning Graduate Committee)

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Very Deficient</i>	<i>Somewhat Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
Completed in a timely manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed more than two years after preliminaries; • Defense more than three years after passing preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed 13 to 24 months after passing preliminaries. • Defense within three years after preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed within a year after passing preliminaries; • Defense within 2.5 years after preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminaries passed within one year. • Defense within 2 years of passing preliminaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminaries passed within one year. • Defense within 18 months of passing preliminaries
Quality of dissertation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of dissertations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of dissertations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th of dissertations) • Extensions possible, but may require more work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among 10th to 25th percentile of dissertations • Provides opportunities for additional, fruitful research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among top 10% of dissertations. • Student will be able to further extend; • Solid basis for funded projects.
Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires committee to stretch to find contribution. • Closer to MS than outstanding Ph.D. dissertation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends prior knowledge to some degree; • In total is a contribution, but contains no single major contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates originality. • Makes some contributions. • Introduces new methodology or techniques to the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very original work; • At least one important contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original and creative. • Several important contributions.

Publications and potential publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At best a conference proceedings. • Nothing has been submitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential exist for a publication in a second tier journal. • Presented work at least in one conference. • No papers submitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been submitted to a recognized journal. • Should be able to publish one or two papers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been accepted by a recognized journal. • Three or more publications should result. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one paper has been fully accepted or published in a leading journal. • More than three significant publications will result.
Quality of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a professional editor. • Sentence structure, language and style deficient. • Major revisions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is weak. • A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors. • A number of changes required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th percentile). • Limited number of typos (grammatical and spelling errors). • Some normal changes necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well written. • Easy to read and understand. • Very few changes or additions required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reads like an outstanding publication or series of publications. • No typos, grammatical, or spelling errors. • No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.
Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized. • Disjointed presentation. • Unable to answer a number of questions. • Slides and handouts of very poor quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well organized. • Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects. • Had difficulty with questions. • Some slides and handouts difficult to read. • Typos and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable – slides and handouts clear. • Good presentation skills. • Able to answer most questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well thought out slides and handouts. • Professional presentation. • Almost all questions addressed in a professional manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized and very professional. • All questions addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner. • Slides and handouts outstanding.

		other errors on slides.			
<p>Mastery of Learning Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live. ✓ The standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards. ✓ Empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research. ✓ How financial planning is shaped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of dissertations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable, but disappointing (75th to 90th percentile of dissertations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable (25th to 75th of dissertations) • Additional mastery of outcomes will require added work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among 10th to 25th percentile of dissertations • Opportunities for additional mastery apparent, but overall, well done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among top 10% of dissertations. • Student exemplifies mastery of outcomes

by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.					
Other -- explain					

Comments and reasons for any deficiencies:

Appendix B (continued)
Personal Financial Planning
Dissertation – Three Paper – Option Rubric

In addition to completing the **Ph.D. Dissertation Response Sheet** for each student, please also use this dissertation rubric to evaluate the papers written in place of a traditional dissertation.

(One for each committee member - mark response and return directly and confidentially to the student's advisor or the Chair of the Personal Financial Planning Graduate Committee)

Content Criteria – 40%	Well Developed	Acceptable	Unacceptable
✓ Topic of significant to the Personal Financial Planning Field			
✓ Rationale for the study			
✓ Literature review			
✓ Theoretical discussion			
✓ Application of the financial planning processes			
✓ Research methods			
✓ Results			
✓ Conclusions			
✓ Implications			
✓ Overall integration of the following concept: <i>The fundamentals of the financial planning process as the process applies to the behavioral, economic, social, and cultural environments in which individuals and families live.</i>			
✓ Overall integration of the following concept: <i>The standards of ethical conduct which adhere to the Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility developed by the Certified Financial Planner Board of Standards.</i>			
✓ Overall integration of the following concept: <i>Empirical statistical methods and research findings associated with personal finance research.</i>			
✓ Overall integration of the			

following concept: <i>How financial planning is shaped by diverse contexts, cultures, and family relationships.</i>			
<i>Thought and Expression Criteria – 40%</i>	<i>Excellent; Superior to generally thoughtful analysis of complex ideas; minor errors in expression that do not interfere with meaning</i>	<i>Acceptable; Competent analysis of complex ideas; errors in expression affect clarity</i>	<i>Needs a great deal of work; Serious weaknesses in analysis of complex ideas; errors in expression obscure meaning or result in incoherence</i>
✓ Raises vital questions or issues, formulating them clearly and precisely			
✓ Evidence of breadth and depth; Insightful, in-depth analysis of complex ideas			
✓ Main points are developed and supported with relevant information and reference that are appropriately incorporated			
✓ Organization and logic; Well focused and well organized, with well reasoned conclusions. Well written.			
✓ Student thinks open-mindedly within alternative systems of thought, recognizing and assessing, as appropriate, assumptions, implications, and/or practical consequences.			
<i>Technical Criteria – 20%</i>	<i>Excellent; Very few mistakes</i>	<i>Acceptable but needs some work</i>	<i>Needs a great deal of work for improvement</i>
✓ Clarity; Demonstrates high level of vocabulary through careful word choice; sentences are constructed skillfully and purposefully.			
✓ Grammar, punctuation, and spelling.			
✓ APA style; Reference are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided; appropriate use of headings, tables, and figures.			
✓ Demonstration of an understanding of empirical research findings associated with personal finance research.			

✓ Scholarly tone; Paper(s) is(are) written at the level expected for publication.			
---	--	--	--

Evaluative Rubric for Degree Program Assessment Plans

Department: College of Human Ecology

Degree Program Title: Human Ecology Doctorate with an emphasis in Personal Financial Planning

Assessment Plan Elements	Very Good 4	Acceptable 3	Developing 2	Undeveloped 1	Score For Each Element
<i>Student learning outcomes</i>	At least two SLO's are clearly stated using the proper format.	At least two SLO's are stated but with some lack of clarity.	SLO's are stated but unclear regarding one or more critical aspects.	SLO's are not stated in an acceptable format.	4
<i>Assessment method for each outcome</i>	Multiple assessment measures are identified for each outcome.	At least one assessment measure is identified for each outcome.	Assessment measures are identified for some outcomes.	Assessment methods are not identified or inadequately described.	3
<i>One-half or more of the methods are direct measures</i>	At least one-half of assessment measures are direct.			Fewer than one-half of the measures are direct measures.	4
<i>Groups to be included</i>	Groups are clearly identified.			Groups are not identified.	4
<i>Timeline for assessment implementation for next three years</i>	There is a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next three years.	The plan is somewhat clear but has some areas that are incomplete.	Some parameters have been established but a clear timeline is not evident.	There is not a stated implementation plan.	3
<i>Process for data presentation and discussion</i>	The process for the interpretation, presentation, and discussion of the data is clearly described, including who will be involved and timing.	The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	Some aspects of the process are described.	There is no stated plan.	3
<i>Process for implementing revisions based on assessment results</i>	The process for implementing revisions based on assessment results is clearly described.	The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	Some aspects of the process are described.	There is no stated plan.	3

Evaluative Rubric for Degree Program Assessment Plans

Department: College of Human Ecology

Degree Program Title: Human Ecology Doctorate with an emphasis in Personal Financial Planning

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: Tuesday May 6th, 2008

Decision (check one):

- Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)
- Assessment Plan Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

N/A

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

- Please refer to scores on attached rubric.
- Rephrase SLOs 3 and 4 by beginning each with an active, performance-based verb.
- You may consider using a more visual timeline to describe and illustrate timeline for your assessment, review, and action processes.
- You may consider continuing to work on making your Assessment Plan and Report more compact.