# SACS Assessment Plan for Master of Environmental Studies (MSVS) Program

|                       | Degree: Master of Environmental Studies (MSVS) 2023-2024 Assessment Plan  |   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
|                       | Student Learning Outcome #1  Students will be able to explain and provide example of the impact of human activities to the natural environment. |   |  |  |  |
| PLAN                  | Assessment<br>Method(s)   | (1) Comprehensive Exam (Breadth) (2) Comprehensive Exam (Depth)   |  |  |  |
|                       | Proficiency   | Minimum acceptable is 3 out of 4  |  |  |  |
| DO                    | Benchmark   | 75% of students achieve the proficiency mentioned above   |  |  |  |
|                       | Results of<br>Assessment  | For the reporting period 1 student (non-thesis) graduated in the Master of Environmental studies (MSVS) program.  |  |  |  |
|                       |   | Average comprehensive score for SLO 1 is <b>3.87</b> (Appendix A_ Assessment rubric)  |  |  |  |
|                       |   | All students were evaluated 2 times in each indicator, by committee of a minimum two faculty members. Assessment instruments are the performance in comprehensive exam (breadth and depth).   |  |  |  |
| S<br>T<br>U<br>D<br>Y | Analysis of<br>Results  | 100% of the students achieved the proficiency mentioned above.  The student scored well above the minimum acceptable proficiency level. The student reflected favorably to the self-assessment in the survey.  Overall, the students expressed satisfaction for SLO1. |  |  |  |

### ACT Improvement Plan for 2024-2025

With passing scores in all three PI categories for SLO1, we don't anticipate major changes. However, to keep with the advancement in the industry and demand for improved learning, it is important the program maintain continuous improvement to increase the overall scores for PIs and for SLO. For the next academic year, the following improvement steps are proposed:

- Present the findings to the department faculty and maintain and ensure the rigor of all courses.
- Develop Environmental Engineering/Studies Laboratory graduate class.
- Develop and offer more courses aligned with the current industrial needs and advancements.
- Provide wide variety of courses using adjuncts.
- Improve the curriculum using more interdisciplinary project-based modules.
- Offer Engineering with Nature Class (4 graduate classes) through US Army Corps of Engineers.

|             | Degree: Master of Environmental Studies (MSVS) 2023-2024 Assessment Plan |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|             | Student Learning<br>Outcome #3   | Students will demonstrate an ability to design engineering components for mitigating pollutants in the environment   |  |  |  |
| PLAN        | Assessment<br>Method(s)  | (1) Questions, projects and assignments aimed at the design of engineering components in CVEN 5331Biological Wastewater Treatment or CVEN 5329 Water Supply and Treatment (2) Comprehensive Exam   |  |  |  |
|             | Proficiency  | Minimum acceptable is 3 out of 4   |  |  |  |
| DO          | Benchmark  | 75% of students achieve the proficiency mentioned above  |  |  |  |
|             | Results of<br>Assessment   | For the reporting period 1 student (non-thesis) graduated in the Master of Environmental studies (MSVS) program.   |  |  |  |
|             |  | Average comprehensive score for SLO 2 is <b>3.50</b> (Appendix A_ Assessment rubric)   |  |  |  |
|             |  | All students were evaluated 2 times in each indicator, by committee of a minimum two faculty members. Assessment instruments are the performance in projects and assignments in CVEN5331 and CVEN5329 class and comprehensive exam (breadth and depth).                        |  |  |  |
| S<br>T<br>U | Analysis of<br>Results   | 100% of the students achieved the proficiency mentioned above.   |  |  |  |
| D<br>Y      |  | The student scored well above the minimum acceptable proficiency level. The student reflected favorably to the self-assessment in the survey. Overall, the students expressed satisfaction for SLO2.   |  |  |  |
| ACT         | Improvement Plan<br>for 2024-2025  | With passing scores in all three PI categories for SLO2, we don't anticipate major changes. However, to keep with the advancement in the industry and demand for improved learning, it is important the program maintain continuous improvement to increase the overall scores |  |  |  |

for PIs and for SLO. For the next academic year, the following improvement steps are proposed:

- Present the findings to the department faculty and maintain and ensure the rigor of all courses.
- Develop Environmental Engineering/ studies Laboratory graduate class.
- Develop and offer more courses aligned with the current industrial needs and advancements.
- Provide wide variety of courses using adjuncts.
- Improve the curriculum using more interdisciplinary project-based modules.
- Offer Engineering with Nature Class (4 graduate classes) through US Army Corps of Engineers.

|       | Degree: Master of Environmental Studies (MSVS) 2023-2024 Assessment Plan |  |  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
|       | Student Learning<br>Outcome #3   | Students will demonstrate the ability to survey and organize peer-reviewed literature in environmental engineering for problem solving tasks   |  |  |  |
| PLAN  | Assessment<br>Method(s)  | <ul><li>(1) Thesis defense or Comprehensive<br/>Examination</li><li>(2) Projects and assignments in CVEN 5329;<br/>CVEN 5331</li></ul>   |  |  |  |
|       | Proficiency  | Minimum acceptable is 3 out of 4   |  |  |  |
| DO    | Benchmark  | 75% of students achieve the proficiency mentioned above  |  |  |  |
|       | Results of<br>Assessment   | For the reporting period 1 student (non-thesis) graduated in the Master of Environmental studies (MSVS) program.  Average comprehensive score for SLO 3 is 3.62  |  |  |  |
|       |  | (Appendix A_ Assessment rubric)  All students were evaluated 2 times in each indicator, by committee of a minimum two faculty members. Assessment instruments are the performance in projects and assignments in CVEN5331 and CVEN5329 class and comprehensive exam (breadth and depth). |  |  |  |
| STUDY | Analysis of<br>Results   | 100% of the students achieved the proficiency mentioned above.  The student scored well above the minimum acceptable proficiency level. The student reflected favorably to the self-assessment in the survey.  Overall, the students expressed satisfaction for SLO3.                    |  |  |  |
| ACT   | Improvement Plan for 2024-2025   | With passing scores in all three PI categories for SLO3, we don't anticipate major changes. However, to keep with the advancement in the industry and demand for improved learning, it is important the program maintain continuous improvement to increase the overall scores           |  |  |  |

for PIs and for SLO. For the next academic year, the following improvement steps are proposed:

- Present the findings to the department faculty and maintain and ensure the rigor of all courses.
- Coordinate with Department faculty to include more opportunities to the students to review and survey more peer-reviewed literature.
- Develop Environmental Engineering/ Studies Laboratory graduate class.
- Develop and offer more courses aligned with the current industrial needs and advancements.
- Provide wide variety of courses using adjuncts.
- Improve the curriculum using more interdisciplinary project-based modules.
- Offer Engineering with Nature Class (4 graduate classes) through US Army Corps of Engineers.

| Degree: Master of Environmental Studies (MSVS) 2023-2024 Assessment Plan |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | Student Learning Outcome #4  Students must demonstrate the ability to complete masters thesis successfully and effectively communicate the thesis work orally and in Writing |   |  |  |
| PLAN   | Assessment<br>Method(s)  | (1) Thesis Report<br>(2) Final Thesis Defense           |  |  |
|  | Proficiency  | Minimum acceptable is 3 out of 4                        |  |  |
| DO   | Benchmark  | 75% of students achieve the proficiency mentioned above |  |  |
|  | Results of<br>Assessment   | N/A   |  |  |
| S<br>T<br>U<br>D<br>Y  | Analysis of Results  | N/A   |  |  |
| ACT  | Improvement Plan for 2024-2025   |   |  |  |

## Appendix A Faculty Evaluation Sheets

#### **Performance Indicators and Rubrics for Outcome #1:**

An understanding of the impact of human activities to the atmospheric and aquatic environment.

| Performance   | Excellent           | Good                | Satisfactory    | Unsatisfactory     |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Indicator     | 4                   | 3                   | 2               | 1                  |
|               | Evidence of ability |                     | Little          |                    |
|               | to describe         | Evidence of ability | evidence of     |                    |
| An            | pollution sources   | to describe         | ability to      | No knowledge of    |
| understanding | from human          | pollution sources   | describe        | pollution          |
| of pollution  | activity in both    | from human          | pollution       | processes from     |
| sources       | qualitative and     | activity in         | sources from    | human activity     |
|               | quantitative        | qualitative fashion | human           |                    |
|               | fashion             |                     | activity        |                    |
|               | Evidence of         | Evidence of         | Little          |                    |
| Literacy in   | insight to the      | insight to the      | evidence of     | No knowledge       |
| environmental | characteristics of  | characteristics of  | insight to the  | on the             |
| media         | water and air in    | water and air in    | characteristics | characteristics of |
| ineuia        | qualitative and     | qualitative terms   | of water and    | water and air      |
|               | quantitative terms  | only                | air             |                    |

#### **Performance Indicators and Rubrics for Outcome #2:**

An ability to design engineering components to meet the desired needs for pollution control in air and water.

| Performance                         | Excellent  | Good  | Satisfactory  | Unsatisfactory  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Indicator                           | 4  | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| Use of<br>engineering<br>principles | Clear evidence of<br>ability to use<br>engineering<br>principles to<br>design/analyze<br>components of<br>pollution control                            | Some evidence<br>of ability to use<br>engineering<br>principles to<br>design/analyze<br>components of<br>pollution control    | Little evidence<br>of ability to use<br>engineering<br>principles to<br>design/analyze<br>components of<br>pollution<br>control | No evidence of ability to use engineering principles to design/analyze components of pollution control                      |
| Design<br>process                   | Clear evidence of<br>ability to<br>understand the<br>design<br>requirements,<br>analyze different<br>alternatives, and<br>provide a feasible<br>design | Some evidence of ability to understand the design requirements, analyze different alternatives, and provide a feasible design | Little evidence of ability to understand the design requirements, analyze different alternatives, and provide a feasible design | No evidence of ability to understand the design requirements, analyze different alternatives, and provide a feasible design |

#### **Performance Indicators and Rubrics for Outcome #3:**

An ability to survey and organize peer-reviewed literature in environmental sciences and engineering for problem solving.

| Performance  | Excellent  | Good  | Satisfactory  | Unsatisfactory  |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Indicator  | 4  | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| Knowledge of available literature in environmental science and engineering | Can identify the names and describe the scopes of more than 10 peer-review journals  | Can identify the names and describe the scopes of more than 5 peer-review journals                        | Can identify the names of a few peer-review journals but not clear about the scopes   | Do not know the meaning of peer-reviewed literature   |
| Ability of organizing the information published in peer-review literature  | Clear evidence<br>of ability to use,<br>assess, and cite<br>the knowledge<br>in peer-review<br>literature in<br>written form | Some evidence of ability to use, assess, and cite the knowledge in peer-review literature in written form | Little evidence<br>of ability to<br>ability to use,<br>assess, and cite<br>the knowledge<br>in peer-review<br>literature in<br>written form | No evidence of ability to ability to ability to use, assess, and cite the knowledge in peer-review literature |

#### **Performance Indicators and Rubrics for Outcome #4:**

An ability to complete a master thesis and effectively communicate the thesis work orally and in writing.

| Performance                                   | Excellent  | Good  | Satisfactory   | Unsatisfactory   |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Indicator                                     | 4  | 3   | 2  | 1  |
| Thesis<br>significance                        | Clear definition of thesis topic and the thesis results are significant and can be published in peer-reviewed platforms. | Clear definition of thesis topic and the thesis results are meaningful and can be organized in a presentable form to the committee. | Somewhat unclear definition of thesis topic but with justified contributions.  | The thesis topic is ill-defined and lacks significance.  |
| Organization<br>of thesis                     | Organizationa I scheme is logical and complete and makes report especially pleasurable to read.                          | Organizational<br>scheme shows<br>planning and<br>logical order.  | Organizational scheme is not apparent and the readability has room for improvement.                                      | Thesis is not organized and difficult to read.   |
| Thesis<br>presentation<br>& delivery          | Presentation<br>is clear,<br>organized,<br>professional<br>and use<br>visual<br>displays well.                           | Presentation is somewhat lacking in one of the following: clarit y, organization, professionalis m, or use of visual displays.      | Presentation is weak in two or three of the critical areas: clarity, organization, professionalism, and visual displays. | Presentation is weak in all critical areas: clarity, organization, professionalism, and visual displays. |
| Question &<br>answer -<br>impromptu<br>skills | Answers reflect understanding of thesis context. Res ponses are fluent, spontaneous, sincere and confident.              | Answers demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the thesis. Respon ses are relaxed and sincere.                                  | Answers do not covey necessary information. Res ponses are strained.   | Answers to questions show lack of understanding of the thesis. Responses are strained and awkward.       |