1. Assessment information collected
1. Comprehensive examinations
2. Audience evaluations of oral thesis defense, with rankings on a scale of 1-5 (1 being excellent, 5 being poor)
3. Review of graduate theses by Department Chair (rankings: Acceptable, Good, Very good, Outstanding)
4. Presentations and publications by graduates
5. First employment of graduates
6. Exit interview questionnaires collected from graduates to assess satisfaction with program and educational outcomes (rankings: not satisfied, mostly satisfied, very satisfied)

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above
Criticisms primarily included students not providing sufficient “big-picture” context for their research. Low scores at the defense correlated with low ratings of the written thesis from the committee chair or Department Chair, particularly with respect to editorial issues such as grammar, clarity of writing, formatting, missing elements from methods descriptions, and punctuation errors; articulation of the scientific content was also rated poorly in some cases. Students demonstrated command of the current literature in their fields. As noted previously, students seem not to be receiving, or absorbing, help from advisors or committee members in thesis editing. This practice should be addressed by the Department Chair who is clarifying the role of faculty in the thesis editing process to ensure that theses are not put forward for department-level signatures without complete editorial review by all committee members. Students are encouraged to practice writing skills, and to enroll in appropriate courses. At the program level, faculty are encouraged to offer courses with broader inter-disciplinary appeal. Increasing the enrollment in the Oceanography degree programs would also facilitate increased course offerings somewhat (i.e. because there would be sufficient enrollment in those courses).
3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

The MS comprehensive exam requirement was evaluated in some detail previously. There were complaints about effectiveness and appropriateness. Both student and faculty surveys, that included talking directly with students and allowed the next cohorts to vote on aspects of the exam structure (e.g., multi-day vs. single-day exam) showed that most students did not think the exam was unreasonable or unfair. Criticisms seemed to stem from isolated experiences by particular students who did not do well on the exam in the first attempt. We determined that the exam should be retained in its current form, and that effort should be placed on communicating with students about expectations and providing some direction for preparing more effectively.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

The Department Chair is responsible for completing dissertation evaluation forms and reviewing exit interviews and accomplishment forms. All defense seminar attendees are invited to complete defense evaluations. The GPMSL Outcomes Assessment Committee has in the past contributed to program review. CFOS has completed an organizational restructuring, and the current Department Chair will advocate for this committee to be revived under the new structure, so that a broader group of faculty will be involved in program review and improvement.

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program’s Communication Plan, as required by Faculty Senate motion? (required for baccalaureate programs only)

I believe it has been updated.