



**Feedback for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report**  
**Department of Physical Therapy**  
*Doctorate Physical Therapy*

**Amy Liu, Ph.D.**  
**Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)**  
**Professor of Sociology**

**Elizabeth Strasser, Ph.D.**  
**Assessment Consultant, OAPA**  
**Professor of Anthropology**

**Chia-Jung Chung, Ph.D.**  
**Assessment Consultant, OAPA**  
**Associate Professor of Education**

**Judith Kusnick, Ph.D.**  
**Assessment Consultant, OAPA**  
**Professor of Geology**

**Spring 2015**  
**California State University, Sacramento**



California State University, Sacramento  
Office of Academic Program Assessment  
6000 J Street • Eureka Hall 203 • Sacramento, CA 95819-3709  
(916) 278-2497  
<http://www.csus.edu/programassessment>

## I. Summary Memo to the Deans/Chairs/Program Directors

**To:** Chair, Department of Physical Therapy  
**From:** Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)  
**Date:** Spring 2015  
**Subject:** Feedback for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report  
**CC:** Office of Academic Affairs

The 2013-2014 annual assessment reports are based on responses to the [2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Template](#) prepared by the [Office of Academic Program Assessment](#) (OAPA). The feedback for the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report* is summarized below:

<b>Section:</b>	<b>Details:</b>
I	Summary Memo to Deans/Chairs/Program Directors
II	Detailed Feedback for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report
III	Commendations and Recommendations
Appendix 1:	WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”
Appendix 2:	Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for the 21st Century & AAC&U’s 16 VALUE Rubrics
Appendix 3:	Important Considerations for Program Review and Assessment
Appendix 4:	Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes
Appendix 5:	Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review

We have used appropriate Western Associate of Schools and Colleges, WASC, rubrics for guidance on effective assessment practices in several areas, including the quality of learning outcomes, assessment plans, methods/data/analysis, program review, and the use of assessment data for curricular improvement, academic planning, and budgeting. These rubrics were provided in appendices in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Annual Assessment Report*, and will not be repeated here.

We hope all the previous **feedback** reports that you have received in recent years from OAPA in addition to the current one (2011-2012, 2012-2013, and now 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Feedback) will be used to help the academic unit (department, program, or college) determine the extent to which its current assessment system is adequate and what additional components or processes may need to be developed or improved for **all the degree programs** in the academic unit.

We would like to thank Dr. Don Taylor, Interim Assistant Vice President, Academic Programs and Global Engagement, Janett Torset, and our student assistants, Christian and Paul Schoenmann, for their assistance in this assessment review process.

If you have any questions or suggestions, please contact [Dr. Amy Liu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu) (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of OAPA.

Thank you.

## II. Detailed Feedback for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report

### Doctorate Physical Therapy

Template Questions	Detailed Questions/Criteria	Comments	
Q1: Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014	Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014?	Yes	Twelve PLOs: 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, and 18
	Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above.	Not Clear	I: Are the following 5 items the PLOs or the assessment tools? 1. <i>Graduates' self-assessment as to whether they have achieved program educational goals and objectives at time of graduation;</i> 2. <i>Graduates' ultimate pass rate of the National Physical Therapy Examination averaged over the last three years;</i> 3. <i>National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area Average Score;</i> 4. <i>Graduates' aggregate performance on criteria in the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI);</i> 5. <i>Evaluation of graduates' portfolios.</i> II: If the above 5 are assessment tools, what are the PLOs the 5 tools explicitly assess? Are these PLOs exactly the same as those indicated in Q1.1?
	Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?	Yes	
	Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)? If no, skip to Q1.4.	Yes	
	Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?	Yes	
	Q1.4. Have you used the <i>Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)</i> * to develop your PLO(s)?	N/A	
Q2: Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO	Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted EXPLICIT standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? If no, skip to Q2.2.	Yes	For all See Q1.1.1
	Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, for each PLO?	Not Clear	Please provide the following information: 1. What are the program goals/objectives and their desired level of learning?

			<p>2. How is the NPTE explicitly linked to each PLO?</p> <p>3. What are the 18 performance criteria? How are they linked to the program goals/objectives, Q1.1, and NPTE?</p> <p>Please include detailed assessment tools and rubrics here or in appendix, and <i>explicitly</i> link how the two connect to Q1.1, and/or to program's own PLOs (if they are different).</p>
	Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014? If no, skip to Q3.1.	Yes	Please provide information on how each of the five assessment tools is explicitly linked to EACH PLO.
	Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published?	Yes	Assessment/Program review
Q3: Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO	Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014? If no, skip to end, Part III.	Yes	
	Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014? If no, skip to end, Part III.	Yes	
	Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014?	Yes	Please provide tables and graphs for EACH PLO. Required threshold of 80% and all students are scoring well above.
	Q3.4.1 First PLO: Critical Thinking	Yes	Met
	Q3.4.1.A. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome?	Not Clear	<i>How do the assessment tools explicitly connect to your chosen PLOs or any other measure/data reported in Q2.1.1 and Q3.3?</i>
	Q3.4.2 Second PLO: Information Literacy	Yes	Met
	Q3.4.2.A. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome?	Not Clear	See above.
	Q3.4.3-12 Third-Twelfth PLOs: 3) Written Communication, 4) Oral Communication, 5) Inquiry and Analysis, 6) Team Work, 7) Problem Solving, 8) Intercultural Knowledge and Competency, 9) Ethical Reasoning, 10) Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning, 11) Integrative and Applied Learning, and 12) Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline	Yes	Met for all
	Q3.4.3-12.A. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome?	Not Clear	See above.

Q4: Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity	Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year?	Missing	Did program assess all twelve?
	Q4.1.A: According to you (the reader) has the program EXPLICITLY assessed each of the PLOs listed above?	Not Clear	See Q3.4.1A
	Q4.2. Please choose ONE ASSESSED PLO as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14. If ONE PLO, skip.	Yes	Overall Competencies in Major/Discipline
	Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO? If no, skip to Q4.4.	Yes	
	Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used?	Yes	Classroom based performance assessment, other portfolios
	Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data.	Yes	Orthopedic Evaluation and Neurological Physical Therapy Evaluation in portfolio
	Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?	Yes	
	Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?	Yes	
	Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? If no, skip to Q.4.3.7.	Not Clear	Rubric pilot-tested and refined by group of faculty <i>Where is this rubric?</i>
	Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio?	Not Clear	A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty. Please provide the rubric and its connection to each PLO and assignment.
	Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?	N/A	
	Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?	Yes	
	Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?	No	
	Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?	Yes	
	Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)? Please briefly specify:	Yes	All student portfolios were evaluated
Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? If no, skip to Q4.5.	Yes		

	Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?	Yes	Alumni Surveys/focus groups/interviews, other: licensing exam data
	Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?	Yes	
	Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?	Yes	Examine all alumni six months after they're licensed
	Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO? If no, skip to Q.4.6.	Yes	
	Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?	Yes	National Disciplinary/State Professional Licensing Exam (CTI Instrument)
	Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? If no, skip to Q4.7.	Yes	
	Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify:	Yes	Student's clinical internships <i>Clinical performance Instrument</i>
	Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data?	Yes	Online survey software tool
	Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? If only <u>one</u> , skip to Q5.1.	Yes	Five, see Q1.1.1
	Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?	Not Clear	
	Q4.8.2. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?	Not Clear	
Q5: Use of Assessment Data	Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results from 2012-2013 been used for?	Yes	Improving specific courses, modifying curriculum, improving advising/mentoring, updating assessment plan/reports/review, etc.
	Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.	Missing	
	Q5.2. As a result of the assessment effort in 2013-2014 and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program? If no, skip to Q.5.3.	Yes	
	Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications?	Yes	Make sure gains are maintained.

	Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?	Yes	
	Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs. If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. (optional)	N/A	
Q6: Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?	Same as Q1.1		
Appendix	Are appendices related to the assessment reported?	No	Please provide the CTI instrument, rubric, and data tables to illustrate your findings.
Summary	S1. Does the program follow the required assessment template?	Yes	
	S2. Is the assessment report easy to read and understand?	Mostly	
	S3. Can the reader conclude that students in this program meet the standard(s) based on the data AND results provided in this report?	Not Clear	It is difficult to know how students meet the twelve PLOs the program identified without explicit links among the PLOs, rubrics, measures/methods, and data.

### III. Commendations and Recommendations

#### Commendations:

The program has used at least five assessment tools and collected a lot of data. It is commended for addressing the following areas well:

##### **Data Collection and Presentation:**

-Used national exam, surveys, and internship portfolios to assess student learning outcomes at graduation.

##### **Standards of Performance at Graduation:**

-Developed **explicit** standards of performance for **all** the assessment tools.

##### **Use of Assessment Data:**

-Used data and feedback from the **Office of Academic Program Assessment** to improve courses, curriculum, advising, the assessment plan and program review, strategic planning, and faculty/staff development.

#### Recommendations:

As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to:

##### **Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:**

-Clearly articulate and/or explicitly provide the PLOs: What students should know, value, and be able to do at or near graduation by using specific, **measurable** verbs in the report (e.g. verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy).

##### **Data Collection and Presentation:**

-Focus on assessing each PLO, not on assessment tools.

-Provide **explicit** links that directly connect each PLO, rubric, standard of performance, assessment tool, and data.

-Use tables to simply and clearly present data for each PLO so faculty and the general public can understand conclusions for each PLO, not just for each assessment tool.

##### **Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:**

-Make sure that the rubric used to evaluate/assess student work (projects, papers, and key assignments) **aligns** directly and explicitly with PLOs and the key assignments.

-Use curriculum maps and backward design to **link** how assignments, PLOs, and rubrics **align** and where learning and assessment may take place.

##### **Standards of Performance at Graduation:**

-Develop **explicit** standards of performance for **EACH PLOs** and report the percentages of students who meet these standards **at graduation**.

-Include PLOs, rubrics, and standard of performance by graduation, in **all** course syllabi and catalogs for the program that claims to introduce/develop/master the PLOs.



## Appendix 1: WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”

<http://www.wascsenior.org/search/site/Rubrics%20combined>

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
1.Comprehensive List	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, and disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).	The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.	The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome.
2.Assessable Outcomes	Outcomes statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. “Statements understand scientific method” do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., “Graduates can write reports in APA style” or “Graduate can make original contributions to biological knowledge.”	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria statements such as rubrics, and have identified example of student performance at varying levels of each outcome.
3.Alignment	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.	Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.
4.Assessment Planning	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in current year.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
5.The Student Experience	Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere.	Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcome levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.

## Appendix 2: Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for The 21st Century & AAC&U's 16 VALUE Rubrics

<http://www.csus.edu/wascaccreditation/Documents/Endnotes/E044.pdf>

1. **Competence in the Disciplines:** The ability to demonstrate the competencies and values listed below in *at least one major field of study* and to demonstrate informed understandings of other fields, drawing on the knowledge and skills of disciplines outside the major.
2. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World** through study in the *sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts*. Focused by engagement with big questions, contemporary and enduring.
3. **Intellectual and Practical Skills, including:** *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving*, practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance.
  - 3.1 [Critical thinking](#) (WASC core competency)
  - 3.2 [Information literacy](#) (WASC core competency)
  - 3.3 [Written communication](#) (WASC core competency)
  - 3.4 [Oral communication](#) (WASC core competency)
  - 3.5 [Quantitative literacy](#) (WASC core competency)
  - 3.6 [Inquiry and analysis](#) (Sixth VALUE rubric)
  - 3.7 [Creative thinking](#) (Seventh VALUE rubric)
  - 3.8 [Reading](#) (Eighth VALUE rubric)
  - 3.9 [Teamwork](#) (Ninth VALUE rubric)
  - 3.10 [Problem solving](#) (Tenth VALUE rubric)
4. **Personal and Social Responsibility (Values), including:** *civic knowledge and engagement—local and global, intercultural knowledge and competence\**, *ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning* anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.
  - 4.1 [Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global](#) (Eleventh VALUE rubric)
  - 4.2 [Intercultural knowledge and competence](#) (Twelfth VALUE rubric)
  - 4.3 [Ethical reasoning](#) (Thirteenth VALUE rubric)
  - 4.4 [Foundations and skills for lifelong learning](#) (Fourteenth VALUE rubric)
  - 4.5 [Global Learning](#) (Fifteenth VALUE rubric)
5. **Integrative Learning \*\***, including: *synthesis and advanced accomplishment* across general and specialized studies.
  - a. [Integrative and applied learning](#) (Sixteen VALUE rubric)

*All of the above are demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities (values) to new settings and complex problems.*

*\*Understanding of and respect for those who are different from oneself and the ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.*

*\*\* Interdisciplinary learning, learning communities, capstone or senior studies in the General Education program and/or in the major connecting learning goals with the content and practices of the educational programs including GE, departmental majors, the co-curriculum and assessments.*

### Appendix 3: Important Considerations for Program Review & Assessment

Please keep the following questions in mind when you (program, department, or the college) assess student learning outcomes and improve the programs:

- 1) What are your program learning outcomes (PLOs): **what should your students know, value, and be able to do (at the time of graduation)?** Are the PLOs aligned closely with the missions and vision of the university and the college/department/program? Is each program learning outcome aligned closely with the curriculum, the key assignment, pedagogy, grading, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?
- 2) Is each PLO assessable? What **rubrics** are used to assess a particular program learning outcome? What are the explicit **criteria** and **standards of performance** for each outcome? Have you achieved the learning outcomes: **the standards near or at graduation?**
- 3) **What are the data, findings, and analyses for EACH program learning outcome? What is the quality of the data: how reliable and valid is the data?** Other than GPA, what data/evidences are used to determine whether your graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (BA/BS or MA/MS)? If two or more pieces of assessment data are used for each outcome, is the data consistent or contradictory?
- 4) Are these PLOs (together with the data and the standards of performance **near or at graduation**) able to demonstrate the **meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness** of your degree program?
- 5) **Who is going to use the data?** Are the data, findings, or analyses clearly presented so they are easy to understand and/or use? Is the data used only for the course or for the program where the data is collected, or is the data also used broadly for the curriculum, budgeting, or strategic planning at the department, the college, or the university?
- 6) **Are students aware of these learning outcomes?** Do they often use them to assess the learning outcomes themselves? Where are the program learning outcomes published for view, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs? Are they widely shared?
- 7) Has the program conducted **follow-up assessment** to evaluate the effectiveness of program changes made based on assessment data? **If yes, how effective are those changes to improve student learning and success?** If no, what is your plan to assess the effectiveness of those changes?
- 8) **Is there an assessment plan for each unit (program, department, or college)?** Have curriculum maps been developed? Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time such as within a six-year program review cycle? Is the plan sustainable in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Will the assessment plan be revised as needed?

**Appendix 4: Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes**  
(Based on Bloom's Taxonomy)

Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
Cite	Arrange	Apply	Analyze	Arrange	Appraise
Define	Classify	Change	Appraise	Assemble	Assess
Describe	Convert	Compute	Break Down	Categorize	Choose
Identify	Describe	Construct	Calculate	Collect	Compare
Indicate	Defend	Demonstrate	Categorize	Combine	Conclude
Know	Diagram	Discover	Compare	Compile	Contrast
Label	Discuss	Dramatize	Contrast	Compose	Criticize
List	Distinguish	Employ	Criticize	Construct	Decide
Match	Estimate	Illustrate	Debate	Create	Discriminate
Memorize	Explain	Interpret	Determine	Design	Estimate
Name	Extend	Investigate	Diagram	Devise	Evaluate
Outline	Generalize	Manipulate	Differentiate	Explain	Explain
Recall	Give Examples	Modify	Discriminate	Formulate	Grade
Recognize	Infer	Operate	Distinguish	Generate	Interpret
Record	Locate	Organize	Examine	Manage	Judge
Relate	Outline	Practice	Experiment	Modify	Justify
Repeat	Paraphrase	Predict	Identify	Organizer	Measure
Reproduce	Predict	Prepare	Illustrate	Perform	Rate
Select	Report	Produce	Infer	Plan	Relate
State	Restate	Schedule	Inspect	Prepare	Revise
Underline	Review	Shop	Inventory	Produce	Score
	Suggest	Sketch	Outline	Propose	Select
	Summarize	Solve	Question	Rearrange	Summarize
	Translate	Translate	Relate	Reconstruct	Support
		Use	Select	Relate	Value
			Solve	Reorganize	
			Test	Revise	

Page 37: Adapted from Gronlund (1991).

Allen, Mary. 2004. "Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education". San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing, Part of Jossey-Bass.

## Appendix 5: Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review

Ideally, academic program assessment and review at Sacramento State should be an ongoing process that facilitates continuous program improvement and includes the following areas<sup>1</sup>:

**Assessment Plan:** Each program needs to develop a program assessment plan which contains the following elements: Program goals and learning outcomes, methods for assessing progress toward these outcomes, and a timetable. This plan should be updated annually or frequently.

**Annual Program Assessment Report:** Program learning outcomes (PLOs) should be directly aligned with course learning outcomes (CLOs) and the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals (UBLGs). Programs are asked to provide the Office of Academic Affairs with an annual report (annual assessment report -AAR) on program assessment activities that occurred during the past academic year. These reports should identify learning goals and outcomes that were targeted for program assessment, measures used to evaluate progress toward those outcomes, data and analysis, and changes made or planned in response to the results. Annual program assessment and the assessment reports provide a solid foundation and data for the six year program review at Sacramento State.

**Program Review:** Each department undertakes an extensive program review every six years. As part of the program review process, departments are asked to use annual program assessment data to evaluate how well students are meeting program learning outcomes and university learning goals.

Thus, each department in our university should have in place a system for collecting and using evidence to improve student learning. So far, not all departments have established program learning outcomes and/or approaches to assess learning for all degree programs; it is essential to make these expectations explicit. This will help departments and colleges to assure that every degree program has or will have in place a quality assurance system for assessing and tracking student learning, and use this information to improve their respective programs. Importantly, departments should also present learning expectations, data, findings, and analysis in a way that is easy to understand and/or to use by the faculty, students, administration, the general public, accreditation agencies, and policy-makers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from the information at <http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/>