

2009-10 RPTA OUTCOME
ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM
FALL 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2009-10 Assessment Plan Matrix.....	3
7.01.01.....	4
7.01.02.....	6
7.02.01.....	10
7.02.02.....	12
7.02.03.....	15
7.03.02.....	19
7.04	21

Following availability of the SUNY Cortland Pilot Study and the April 2010 revisions to the 2013 COAPRT Standards, the faculty decided that there were readily available additional outcome measures that we had yet to report. We determined that these measures would provide additional insight into RPTA student learning and would afford us an opportunity for additional triangulation.

The figure below specifies in bold the additional measures for outcome assessment that were reviewed. Although this was not a portion of our initial 2009-10 assessment plan, we feel that it does strengthen the RPTA self study.

The addendum of additional outcome assessments of student learning addressed the following standards:

7.01.01

- RPTA 101 Conference paper

7.01.02

- RPTA 101 Journal review paper

7.02.01

- RPTA 252 Inclusion assignment

7.02.02

- RPTA 252 Lab experience

7.02.03

- RPTA 461 Senior project completion/grade
- Senior project peer review presentations

7.03.02

- RPTA 424 Budget project

7.04

- RPTA 465 Internship Completion/Grade
- RPTA 465 Interns Form D Ratings
- RPTA 465 Interns Form E Ratings

Academic Year 2009-2010 Assesment Plan ADDENDUM FALL 2010		Direct, Indirect, or Process	101	101				360				
			7.01.01 Know scope and practices 7.01.02 Hist, Phil, Sci Fndts 7.01.03 Apply found. To dec. making 7.02.01 Design experience offerings 7.02.02 Exp offer cntx diversity 7.02.03 Ability to evaluate offerings 7.03.01 Mgmt/Admin (Recog) 7.03.02 Mgmt/Admin (Admin) 7.04 Internship									
Dept. Examinations	Direct	101	101					360				
RPTA 101 CPRS Dist. 8 Conference Paper	Direct	X										
RPTA 101 Journal Review Paper	Direct		X									
RPTA 210 Student Self-Assessment	Indirect				X	X		X				
RPTA 252 Inclusion Assignment	Direct				X							
RPTA 252 Lab Experience	Direct					X						
RPTA 405 Human Resource Exercise	Direct							X				
RPTA 405 Case Study Evaluation	Direct								X			
RPTA 405 Student Competency Self-Assessment	Indirect							X		X		
RPTA 424 Student Self-Assessment	Indirect	X		X				X		X		
RPTA 424 Budget Project	Direct									X		
RPTA 461 Senior Project Completion/Grade	Direct						X					
RPTA 465 Interns Form D Ratings	Direct										X	
RPTA 465 Interns Form E Ratings	Direct										X	
RPTA 465 Internship Syllabus	Process										X	
RPTA 465 Internship Completion/Grade	Direct										X	
Senior Project Peer Review Presentations	Direct						X					
RPTA Student Focus Group	Indirect			X	X							
*Bold indicates addendum courses												

7.01.01

RPTA 101 Conference Paper

In RPTA 101 during fall 2009 students were given a choice of attending the California Park and Recreation Society District 8 Conference or attending the HANDS on Health Conference. Thirty-one of 48 students in the class attended the CPRS District 8 Conference. The average grade of the conference write-up paper was an 80.13%.

The assignment and grading rubric are available below.

RPTA 101 Introduction to Recreation, Parks, and Tourism **Conference Attendance and Write-up**

PURPOSE: For students to attend a professional conference in the Recreation, Parks, or Tourism Field.

TASK: To attend a Recreation, Parks, or Tourism Conference during the fall quarter of 2009 or to assist with the conference where needed. Students will select either to attend CRPS (California Parks and Recreation Society) District VIII Conference on Friday, November 13, 2009 in Santa Maria, California or the HANDS for Health Conference (http://cope.calpoly.edu/hands/about_us.html) on Friday, October 30, 2009 at Cal Poly. Another conference may be attended if prior approval is obtained by the instructor. Signs ups will be available for both conferences with 25 spaces available for each.

FORMAT: Your typed letter should **be more than 1 page and should not exceed 1½ - pages**, and it should be single-spaced using Times/Times New Roman, 12 point font, and 1 inch margins.

Review and edit your paper to assure clear, concise, and correct writing.

AUDIENCE: Please write this conference experience write-up/evaluation to the conference host who put on the event. You need to be specific and accurate with your summary and feedback regarding the experience. This paper should be written in a block style business letter format.

ASSIGNMENT:

- Attend a Recreation, Parks, or Tourism Conference.
- Write a letter expressing your opinion of the event. Include an introduction paragraph explaining the purpose of the letter. This should include suggestions for future events. The following is a list of topics that should provide support for your suggestions.
 - Which event did you attend?
 - Summary of each of the sessions at the conference in which you attended. Or summarize what you did for the experience.
 - What did you learn from attending the event?

- What was the most valuable part of the event?
- What part of the event did you not enjoy and why?
- What is your overall feedback of the event?
- Do you have suggestions for improvements and things that should be kept the same for the next event?
- This paper is due 1 week (7-days) after the last day of the conference. If the conference is on a Friday, then the paper is due the following Friday before 5 p.m. to the Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Administration office (11-262) regardless of holidays/vacation days.
- Grading rubric must be submitted with the paper.
- See blackboard (external links) for a web page on how to write a BLOCK style business letter.

Name:

Conference or Volunteer Attendance and Write-up Grading Rubric

A paper:

- Has net superior in four (A-), five (mid A), or six (high A) of the areas below

B paper:

- Has net superior in one (B-), two (B), or three (B+) of the areas below

C paper:

Follows directions (1 to 1½ typed, single-spaced pages, Times/Times New Roman, 1" margins), written in letter format, and uses clear, concise, and correct writing

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

Conference attendance

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

Summary of the conference

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

Inclusion of value/benefits of attending the conference

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

Feedback/suggestions for the conference

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

Moves beyond reporting details to include an analysis of the conference

- superior
- acceptable
- unacceptable

D paper:

- Has net unacceptable in one (D+), two (D), or three (D-) of the areas above

F paper:

- Has net unacceptable in four or more of the areas above

“Net” refers to the difference between superior and unacceptable scores.

Notes:

7.01.02

RPTA 101 Journal Review Paper

To assess entry-level knowledge of the scientific foundations of the profession, students in RPTA 101 completed a journal review assignment of two scholarly journal articles in the fall 2009 and spring 2010. In the paper the students highlighted the main points of the articles, did a comparison/contrast of the articles, discussed their overall opinion of the two articles, and wrote about how recreation, parks, and tourism professionals could use the articles.

The assignment was worth 100 points and was 8% of the total grade for the course. Forty-eight students were enrolled in the fall 2009 course. The average grade on the assignment was 89.11%. In the Spring 2010 course, 43 students were enrolled. The average grade was 81.97%.

These students have a general understanding of finding scholarly journal articles and being able to assess and evaluate what they are reading. The students are able to critically examine journal articles and are able to peer review their colleagues work through this peer graded assignment.

Details on the assignment are available below.

<p>RPTA 101 Introduction to Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Journal Review</p>
--

PURPOSE: Professionals in the Recreation, Parks, and Tourism industry use journals as a way to communicate important information with others in the field. Reading the scholarly articles in these journals is a way for these professionals to stay current with trends, issues, and research in the field. This activity will familiarize you with the scholarly literature and journals in the industry and allow you to participate in a peer-review process similar to what is used to evaluate the quality and content of a scholarly article.

TASK: Select **TWO** articles (on a similar topic) from **TWO** different recreation or leisure studies journals (Use only articles dated between 2000 and the present). A research guide will be posted on blackboard as a resource.

Write a summary of the articles highlighting the main points and giving your opinion of the content. The following is a list of possible questions:

1. What were the main points of the article?
2. How do the articles compare or contrast to each other?
3. Did you find these articles easy to read and to understand? Why or why not?
4. How do you think these articles can be used by recreation, parks, or tourism professionals?

On the due date, bring one copy of your summary to class. You will be giving this to a peer to evaluate your review. Attach a copy of the peer grading rubric to your review.

To gain additional practice in finding scholarly articles, the peer who is reviewing your journal review will find your articles on the library databases and will print out the first page of each article and attach it to the peer review grading rubric.

Your peers will review your journal review and return it to you on the due date. You will then need to make the changes suggested by your peer. On the final due date you will submit the following: (1) instructor grading rubric, (2) new and edited journal review (original given to peer and a new clean copy with changes), (3) peer review grading rubric, (4) peer review copy of the first page of your articles.

FORMAT: Your typed review should **NOT EXCEED 2 pages**, and it should be double-spaced using Times/Times New Roman, 12 point font, and 1 inch margins.

Review and edit your paper to assure clear, concise and correct writing.

Give the complete citation of your article using the following American Psychological Association (APA) format:

Ewert, A. (1993). Differences in the level of motivation based on trip outcome, experience level and group type. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 335-349.

Examples of journals for your articles:

Journal of Leisure Research
Leisure Sciences
Therapeutic Recreation Journal
Sports and Spokes
Park and Recreation Magazine
Society and Natural Resources
Environment and Behavior
Journal of Environmental
Education
Tourism Management

Journal of Park and Recreation Administration
Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
Journal of Applied Recreation Research
Journal of the World Leisure and Recreation
Association
Journal of Travel Research
Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing
Journal of Sustainable Tourism
Journal of Convention and Exhibition Management
Annals of Tourism Research

Journal Review Peer Grading Rubric

Reviewer: _____

Writer: _____

1. How does the writer follow directions with format, editing, and using clear, concise, and correct writing? What suggestions do you have that could strengthen this paper in regard to format?
2. What are the main points of these articles? What suggestions do you have that could help clarify the main points of these articles?
3. What is the opinion of the writer of these particular articles?
4. Do you agree or disagree with this opinion? Please explain your answer.
5. How can these articles be used by Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Professionals? Do you have suggestions on other ways that they can be used as well?
6. Did you attach a copy of the first page of each article to your review?

Name: _____

Journal Review Instructor Grading Rubric

A paper:

- ☐ Has net superior in four (A-), five (mid A), or six (high A) of the areas below

B paper:

- ☐ Has net superior in one (B-), two (B), or three (B+) of the areas below

C paper:

Follows directions (2 typed, double-spaced pages, Times/Times New Roman, 1" margins, copy of first page of the article) and uses clear, concise, and correct writing

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

Includes a peer review form that is complete, accurate, specific, and helpful (Write the name of the student paper that you peer reviewed: _____)

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

Uses APA format

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

Summarizes main points of the article

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

Provides thoughtful opinion of the article

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

Explains how article can be used by recreation, parks, and tourism professionals

- ☐ superior
- ☐ acceptable
- ☐ unacceptable

D paper:

- ☐ Has net unacceptable in one (D+), two (D), or three (D-) of the areas above

F paper:

- ☐ Has net unacceptable in four or more of the areas above
- “Net” refers to the difference between superior and unacceptable scores.

Notes:

7.02.01

RPTA 252 Inclusion Assignment

In RPTA 252 students completed a case study that provided them with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge ability to design recreation and related professional experiences. The students are required to choose a scenario (they are given three to choose from) and write a paper that exhibits their knowledge of resources, disabilities, ADA requirements, inclusion, and respect. The paper is graded on knowledge as well as presentation, spelling, and grammar. The aggregate of grades for winter and spring 2010 for this assignment were: 78% = A, 11% = B, <1% = C, 0% = D, and <1% = F. Therefore it can be concluded that most of the students had an ability to demonstrate their knowledge in this area.

The case studies and grading rubric for the assignment are available below.

RPTA 252 Inclusion Report

Utilizing the Inclusion Process outlined in your Inclusion text, choose **ONE** of the scenarios below and write a double-spaced two-page, or less, typed paper on your inclusion process. Be sure to exhibit knowledge of resources, disability, ADA requirements, inclusion **and** respect. Presentation, spelling and grammar will be taken into consideration when grading.

1. Zena, an accountant in your hometown, would like to participate in a tennis program offered by the country club of which she is a member. As the director of recreation for this country club, what might you do to facilitate participation by Zena, who has paraplegia, in the tennis program?
2. Shayna would like to use our cruise line to take a vacation with her husband. She has communicated to you that she has diabetic retinopathy, a disorder of the retina due to diabetes. As a member of the recreation department on the ship, identify some adaptations or considerations we may make when attempting to make this vacation one of the best Silva has ever experienced.
3. Joseph, a teenager, would like to participate in the recreational basketball league offered by the local parks and recreation department. Since Joseph happens to have a hearing loss caused by a childhood disease, identify ways we may assist Joseph in having a successful experience with the basketball league.

Grading Inclusion Assignment Requirements

2 Points possible each Category:

- Resources sited – 2 or more (2pts), 1 (1pt), 0 (0 pts)
- Disability Knowledge examples – 2 or more (2pts), 1(1pt), 0 (0 pts)
- ADA Knowledge examples – 2 or more (2pts), 1 (1pt), 0 (0 pts)

- Inclusion examples – 2 or more (2pts), 1 (1pt), 0 (0 pts)
- Respect examples – 2 or more (2pts), 1 (1pt), 0 (0 pts)

Spelling – 1 point off for 3 or more misspellings

Grammar – 1 point off for 4 or more grammatical errors

Timeliness - 1 point off for everyday late up to 2 days, then 2 points off per day

Total Possible Points = 10

A = 90% and above

B = 80 - 89%

C = 70 – 79%%

D = 60 - 69%

F = < 59%

7.02.02

RPTA 252 Lab Experience

RPTA 252 students demonstrated the ability to facilitate recreation and related professional experiences for diverse clientele, settings, cultures, and contexts through a lab assignment. In the lab assignment students are required to complete 20 hours of volunteer experience working for an agency that is a therapeutic recreation service provider. During the 20 hours students are given assignments by the agency, must communicate openly and have positive interactions, and must demonstrate a willingness to serve the people in the agency. Supervisors completed an agency evaluation. Please see below for the assignment details.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo

RPTA 252 Lab Report

Prepare a **typewritten** or **computer-generated** report on your lab experience that includes all of the following components:

1. Identify the agency where you completed your lab hours.
2. Describe some of the disabilities of the person(s) with whom you worked.
3. What aspects of the person(s) life and lifestyle are affected by his/her disability? Explain:
4. What are some of the strengths and abilities of the person(s) you worked with?
5. What program adaptations, environmental modifications, and/or specialized leadership techniques did you observe or implement during your lab experience? Explain:
6. Identify ways in which you could eliminate or minimize the barriers affecting the lifestyles of the person(s) with whom you worked, especially with regard to his/her participation in leisure opportunities.
7. How many hours have you completed?

***Attach Timesheet to Lab Report**

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo

RPTA 252, Therapeutic *Recreation and Special Populations*

Agency Evaluation of Student Lab Hours

Note: Student must give this form to the agency supervisor prior to the ninth week of the quarter.

REC 252 Instructor: Rene' Van Hoorn Phone: 637-8697 E-mail: rsvanhoo@calpoly.edu

Student's Name: _____ **Quarter/Year** _____

AGENCY SUPERVISOR: Please complete this form and return the evaluation to the student for him/her to review and ask questions as needed. **Obtain the student's signature** on the form and give the student the evaluation to deliver to the instructor at the beginning of the last regular class meeting. Please call if you have any questions. Thank you for your time and effort with our students.

1. Did the student complete the required 20 hours of lab experience with your agency this quarter?
Yes____ No____ If not, why? _____

Hours to be completed, if any: _____
2. What assignments were given to the student? Did the student respond willingly to these assignments?
3. Did the student demonstrate a willingness to communicate openly, yet professionally, with the people served by your agency? How might the student improve his/her interactions with your clientele?
4. Did the student demonstrate a willingness to identify, eliminate or minimize attitudinal, social, communicative, transportation and/or architectural barriers that affect the lives of the people served by your agency? Explain:

Agency Supervisor's Signature: _____ **Title:** _____
Printed Name: _____ **Date:** _____
Organization's Name: _____ **Phone No.:** _____
Organization Address: _____

**NOTE: STUDENT MUST SIGN THIS FORM BEFORE RETURNING TO
INSTRUCTOR**

For student: I have reviewed the agency evaluation and discussed any concerns or questions with my agency supervisor. My signature does not imply that I agree or disagree with the contents of this evaluation but, rather, that I did review its contents.

Student Comments:

Student's Signature

Date Signed

7.02.03

RPTA 461 Senior Project Completion/Grades

RPTA students complete a senior project over six months in RPTA 460 and RPTA 461 as a capstone experience. The senior project is a four-chapter individual research project that includes a literature review, design and methods, results, and discussion and conclusions. During the past three academic years, the percentage of students enrolled in RPTA 461 that have successfully earned a grade of C- or better has ranged from a low of 74% in 2007-08 to a high of 83% in 2008-09. An analysis of senior project grades was also completed in 2005-06 and a policy was established at that time to reduce RP grades. Although unauthorized withdrawals have been eliminated over the past two years, Incomplete and Report in Progress grades have not declined and have increased when compared to 2005-06. This may be due to Cal Poly's change to an electronic submission of the senior project that has been a challenging transition for students and faculty. Faculty annually address the senior project policies and criteria and should once again evaluate the extent of RP and I grades.

The senior project manual is available at:

<http://www.rpta.calpoly.edu/internships.html>

Senior Project Completion/Grade by Frequency and Percentage

	2007 - 2008		2008 - 2009		2009 - 2010	
Senior Project Grade	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>
90 - 100%	24	20	20	17	16	12
80 - 89%	45	38	43	36	41	32
70 - 79%	6	5	20	17	22	17
60 - 69%	1	1	2	2	5	4
below 59%	2	2	0	0	0	0
Withdrawal Unauthorized	6	5	0	0	0	0
Incomplete	1	1	6	5	6	5
Withdrawn	1	1	0	0	0	0
Report Delayed/Report in Progress	13	11	8	7	9	7
Average GPA	2.87		2.93		2.79	

7.02.03

Senior Project Peer Review Presentations

From 2007 to 2010, students worked with faculty to present 22 presentations/posters at conferences using findings from senior projects. By using their senior project research, students had the opportunity to evaluate and research a problem relating to recreation, parks, and tourism and then present and share the results to a professional group at a conference. The conferences have included: National Intramural & Recreational Sports Association (NRPA), Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium (NERR), Leisure Research Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Region Conference (CPRS), Coalition for Educators in the Outdoors (CEO), and HANDS on Health symposium. All abstracts for the presentations were peer reviewed by experts in the field. Selection of these senior projects as presentations demonstrates a high quality of research, evaluation and program and service offerings.

Presentations have included:

Adams, N. A., & Hendricks, W. W. (2007, March). Parent satisfaction with childcare programs at the Yolo County YMCA [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Sacramento, CA.

Amiedi, B., & Hendricks, W. W. (2008, February). Student motivation and bar attributes of San Luis Obispo drinking establishments [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Long Beach, CA.

Correll, K., & Greenwood, P. B. (2009, October 30). Parent interest level in alternative fitness programs for their children. [Poster] HANDS on Health symposium. San Luis Obispo, CA.

Dere, S., & Greenwood, P. B. (Advisor) (2010, April). Motivation and generational characteristics of student employees in campus recreation. Poster presentation at National Intramural & Recreational Sports Association annual conference in Anaheim, CA.

Endicott, C. S., & Hendricks, W. W. (2007, March). Importance-satisfaction of Calaveras Big Trees State Park visitors. [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Sacramento, CA.

Francis, E. R., & Hendricks, W. W. (2007, March). Poly Escapes trip leader leave no trace competencies. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Sacramento, CA.

Goldenberg, M., Fellows, S., Hill, E., & Gomez, E. (2010, April). Pacific Crest Trail Hikers: An Examination of Outcomes. Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. New York.

Goldenberg, M., & Witt, R. (2008, February). Outcomes Associated with Competitive Skateboarding Using Means-end Theory [poster]. Leisure Education and Research Symposium, California Parks & Recreation Society 2008. Long Beach, CA.

Goldenberg, M., & Wynott, P. (2008, February). Outcomes of Street Skateboarders in California: A Means-End Study. Leisure Education and Research Symposium, California Parks & Recreation Society 2008. Long Beach, CA.

Hale, R., & Goldenberg, M. (2008, February). Satisfaction and Motivation of San Luis Obispo County Parks' Volunteers [poster]. Leisure Education and Research Symposium, California Parks & Recreation Society 2008. Long Beach, CA.

Hill, E., Goldenberg, M., Gomez, E., Fellows, S., Friedt, B., & Hill, L. (2010, January). Comparison of Appalachian Trail and Pacific Crest Trail Hikers: Motivations and Benefits. Coalition for Educators in the Outdoors, Bradford Woods, IN.

Jahns, D., & Greenwood, P. B. (2010, March). Assessment of spectator and coach comments during youth baseball games in San Luis Obispo County. Poster presentation at the Leisure Research Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference, Palm Springs, CA.

Lien, M., & Goldenberg, M. (2008, February). Outcomes and Benefits of Wilderness Orientation Programs. Leisure Education and Research Symposium, California Parks & Recreation Society 2008. Long Beach, CA.

Montoya, D., & Greenwood, P. B. (2009, October 30). The relationship between physical activity, self-esteem, and childhood obesity. [Poster] HANDS on Health symposium. San Luis Obispo, CA

Parmer, J. C., & Hendricks, W. W. (2008, February). Blu Emursion women's surf-clothing brand product assessment [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Long Beach, CA.

Petit, A., & Hendricks, W. W. (2008, February). Whispers in the dunes: Visitor comments [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Long Beach, CA.

Rasmussen, B., & Greenwood, P. B. (2009, March). Participant motivations in choosing types of golf courses in San Luis Obispo County [Poster]. Leisure Research Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Santa Clara, CA.

Smith, C., & Greenwood, J.B. (2010, March). Student beliefs about the benefits of travel and leisure: A qualitative analysis. 2010 California and Pacific Southwest Recreation and Park Training Conference Leisure Research Symposium, Palm Springs, CA.

Sobieralski, A., & Greenwood, P. B. (2009, March). Examination of motivation and tournament attribute preferences of highly skilled male and female golfers participating in selected competitive tournaments [Poster]. Leisure Research Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Santa Clara, CA.

Stinson, S., & Hendricks, W. W. (2010, March). Visitor attitudes towards a potential entry fee to Montana de Oro State Park [poster]. California and NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation and Park Training Conference Leisure Research Symposium, Palm Springs, CA.

Stokes, S., & Hendricks, W. W. (2008, February). North Lake Tahoe local and visitors place attachment [poster]. Leisure Research and Education Symposium of the California & NRPA Pacific Southwest Recreation & Park Conference. Long Beach, CA.

Willson, A., Greenwood, P. B., & Goldenberg, M. (2007, March). Assessment of membership at USA Waterski, Inc [poster]. Leisure Education and Research Symposium, California Parks & Recreation Society. Sacramento, CA.

7.03.02

RPTA 424 Budget Project

Students in RPTA 424 complete an extensive budget project that provides them with the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to apply multiple management and administrative concepts, principles, and procedures.

The majority of students' grades on the budget project for the 2009-10 academic year were between 80 and 89%. Faculty should attempt to ascertain why nearly 13% of the students are not receiving a passing grade on the project and develop strategies for improving passing rate for the class.

The budget project grading rubric is available below.

Budget Project Grades by Frequency and Percentage

Project Grade	%	<i>f</i>
90-100%	21.18	18
80-89%	51.76	44
70-79%	14.12	12
60-69%	9.41	8
Below 59%	3.53	3

RPTA 424: BUDGET PROJECT ASSESSMENT						RPTA 424: BUDGET PROJECT ASSESSMENT						60	60	100%
Grading Scale:						Grading Scale:						55	60	92%
	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor		Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	50	60	83%
	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	45	60	75%
	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1	40	60	67%
NAME:						NAME:						35	60	58%
MEMORANDUM: 25 POINTS						MEMORANDUM: 25 POINTS						30	60	50%
GOALS						GOALS						25	60	42%
unique for division						unique for division						20	60	33%
guideline for division operation						guideline for division operation								
beyond thre required budget polices						beyond thre required budget polices								
NEW PROGRAM OUTLINE						NEW PROGRAM OUTLINE								
appropriate for divison/agency						appropriate for divison/agency								
adequate format information						adequate format information								
self-supporting						self-supporting								
program complexity						program complexity								
FOLLOW BUDGET POLICIES						FOLLOW BUDGET POLICIES								
followed budget policies/instruction						followed budget policies/instruction								
adequate support for						adequate support for								
assumptions/actions taken						assumptions/actions taken								
provided adequate impact						provided adequate impact								
information						information								
quantitative vs. subjective support						quantitative vs. subjective support								
CAPITAL REQUEST						CAPITAL REQUEST								
appropriate for division						appropriate for division								
adequate support information						adequate support information								
followed guidelines						followed guidelines								
provided two bids						provided two bids								
FINANCIAL BUDGET: 35 POINTS						FINANCIAL BUDGET: 35 POINTS								
APPEARANCE/ORGANIZATION						APPEARANCE/ORGANIZATION								
professional levels of documents						professional levels of documents								
writing style:content and grammar						writing style:content and grammar								
worksheets/summary sheets easy to read						worksheets/summary sheets easy to read								
adequate details on worksheets						adequate details on worksheets								
followed layout instructions						followed layout instructions								
information in correct format						information in correct format								
MEETING BUDGET GOALS						MEETING BUDGET GOALS								
met budget goals						met budget goals								
assumptions were local/reasonable						assumptions were local/reasonable								
selection of budget strategy						selection of budget strategy								
CALCULATIONS						CALCULATIONS								
correct calculations						correct calculations								
summary sheet/worksheets match						summary sheet/worksheets match								
FEE BUDGET						FEE BUDGET								
correct layout						correct layout								
provide adequate expenses for						provide adequate expenses for								
program						program								
realistic fee structure/income						realistic fee structure/income								
projections						projections								
TOTAL						TOTAL								
/60=						/60=								

RPTA 7.04

RPTA 465 Internship Completion/Grades

During the past three academic years, the percentage of students enrolled in RPTA 465 who have successfully earned credit has ranged from 62% to 100%. Failure by academic year was 1.1% 2007-08, 3.0% 2008-09, and 4.7% 2009-10. Students not earning credit have received either a NC = No Credit, I = Incomplete, W = Withdrawn or RD/RP = Report Delay/Report in Progress. The majority of students who receive a NC, I, or RP grade are on a schedule that does not fit the traditional quarter schedule and they receive the grade once the internship has been completed. Faculty should discuss standardizing the basis for these grades. Using the major's excellent graduation rates as criteria, these percentages are not considered problematic.

The internship manual is available at:

<http://www.rpta.calpoly.edu/internships.html>

RPTA 465 Students Internship Completion by Percentage

Quarter	<i>f</i>	% Complete	% NC	% I	% RP	% W
Summer 2007	42	66.7		33.3		
Fall 2007	10	70.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
Winter 2008	6	83.3		16.7		
Spring 2008	32	90.6		9.4		
Summer 2008	25	84.0	8.0	8.0		
Fall 2008	10	100.0				
Winter 2009	9	66.7		33.3		
Spring 2009	23	91.3		8.7		
Summer 2009	42	66.7	9.5	23.8		
Fall 2009	15	93.3				6.7
Winter 2010	13	61.5		15.4	23.1	
Spring 2010	15	93.3		6.7		

7.04

RPTA 465 Interns Form D Ratings

Faculty conducted an assessment of interns' mid-quarter professional performance for 28 interns during fall 2009 through spring 2010. A similar assessment was completed in 2007-08. Mean scores are based on agency supervisor ratings of intern

performance using a 5-point scale. Congruent ratings from 2007-08 are generally lower than the 2009-10 ratings.

RPTA 465 Form D Ratings Intern Professional Performance by Mean

Professional Performance	Mean	N/A <i>f</i>	N/A %
Establishes work objectives	4.57	0	
Plans work to be accomplished	4.35	2	7.14
Organizes work well	4.38	2	7.14
Has concern for quality of work	4.74	1	3.57
Displays ability to solve problems	4.68	0	
Utilizes all available resources	4.68	1	3.57
Displays ability to lead and direct	4.31	1	3.57
Has ability to work independently	4.38	0	
Possesses strong communication skills	4.38	2	7.14
Is critical of own performance & work quality	4.39	0	
Completes assignments on time	4.64	1	3.57
Maintains atmosphere of sharing ideas	4.55	6	21.42

7.04

RPTA 465 Interns Form E Ratings

An overall assessment of each intern is completed as a portion of Form E, the internship final evaluation form. During the 2009-10 academic year, the overall rating for 26 interns was assessed. Twenty interns received an outstanding rating and six interns received a good rating as an evaluation of their overall performance by their agency supervisor.