2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report;* Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline)*.

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future years.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes"; 2) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; 3) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; and 4) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews".

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [_Child Development_]

B2. Report author(s): [_Kristen Alexander, Graduate Program Coordinator_]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [__38___]
*Us*e the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:
(http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
X	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (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**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [*]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency

	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were **assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:** a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

<u>**Q1.1.1.**</u> Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Child Development graduate program has developed six program learning outcomes (Appendix A). This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 3 (**PLO 3: Critical thinking**): Child development graduate students will analyze and synthesize ideas and evidence in various child development domains (**PLO 3: CRITICAL THINKING**; adapted from VALUE critical thinking rubric and Degree Qualifications Profile; assessment rubric in Appendix B). Students will:

    3.1 Demonstrate understanding of the framework and methodology of quantitative and qualitative research, including the ability to locate, understand, critique and report research findings;
    3.2 Clearly state the issue to be considered, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding;
    3.3 Gather information from reliable sources with enough evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis; viewpoints are questioned thoroughly;
    3.4 Systematically and methodically analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position;
    3.5 Acknowledge limits to knowledge and sources, accounting for the complexities of an issue; and
    3.6 Draw logical conclusions based on informed evaluation.

AND

Program learning outcome 5 (PLO 5: Appreciation of differences): Child development graduate students will value differences in personal experience, both as a driving force for child development and as a framework for understanding and approaching issues in child development (**PLO 5: APPRECIATION OF DIFFERENCES**; assessment rubric in Appendix C). Students will:

    5.1 Analyze theory and evidence concerning cross-cultural factors that influence children's development; and
    5.2 Articulate insights about and appreciation for individual differences in culture (including gender, social, ability, and language) and socialization in development and how they produce diversity and shape child development across domains.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q1.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q1.4**)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) [*] to develop your PLO(s)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

[*] **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP**) – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details: http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html.

Question 2 (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**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **ALL** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2) these are in progress**
	4. Don't know (**Go to Q2.2**)
	5. Not Applicable (**Go to Q2.2**)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014**?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (**If no, go to Q3.1**) ******Revisions of PLOs occurred based on previous assessment feedback and program change. Revisions are expected to be complete in fall 2014 to be published at that time

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In **SOME course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In **ALL course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014**? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Table 1 shows data for PLO 3: Critical thinking.

Table 1: Critical Thinking

Different Levels / Six Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	(3.5)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Mean (N=8)
3.1: Methods			50%		38%	13%		2.4
3.2: Clarity of issue	50%		38%		13%			3.38
3.3: Evidence	13%		75%	13%				3.06
3.4: Student's position		25%	25%	13%	38%			2.69
3.5: Identify limitations	13%	13%	25%	13%	38%			2.75
3.6: Conclusion/evaluate	13%	25%	25%	13%	25%			2.94
OVERALL PLO 3	**15%**	**10%**	**40%**	**8%**	**25%**	**2%**		**2.88**

Based on the rubric used to score critical thinking (Appendix B). a majority of the students demonstrated critical thinking, although specific areas of critical thinking require examination. For example, issues/problems to be considered critically were often stated clearly, providing the audience with relevant information necessary for a full understanding (PLO 3.2). Almost 88% of our students scored 3 or more. Moreover, 88% of our students scored 3 or greater in gathering information from reliable sources with evaluation of research and viewpoints being presented (PLO 3.3). Finally, 63% of our students logically and clearly tied their conclusions to research, including studies showing opposing viewpoints (PLO 3.6). The remainder of the students oversimplified their findings and/or neglected to consider other potential viewpoints about their conclusions.

PLO 3.1 concerned understanding of qualitative *and* quantitative methods to inform critical thinking. Although half of the students demonstrated proficiency in identification and compilation of such evidence, another half lacked such proficiency, particularly in clarifying qualitative methods to inform their argument. Similarly, for PLO 3.4, only half of our students demonstrated a thorough analysis of their own and others' assumptions with consideration of context in presenting the argument. In most cases, for those scoring below 3 using the rubric, students did not make explicit their own assumptions as potential limitations to objectivity in their research. For PLO 3.5, 50% of our students accounted for the complexities of the issue; however, the remainder lacked clarification of the limitations of their research in generalizing their ideas. In an effort to find research supporting their ideas, these students often failed to address the complexities of the issue and its limitations.

Overall, 65% of our students achieved 3 or greater in critical thinking across all measures assessed. Of the remaining students, all but one achieved some milestone in development of critical thinking on all aspects assessed.

These results lead to multiple conclusions. A majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for critical thinking prior to exiting our program, yet not *all* students are doing so. The program needs to re-evaluate PLO 3.1 to determine whether it is stated and assessed as desired. Specifically, do we want to require both qualitative and quantitative research be delineated in each paper and if so, are these expectations clear to students? Also, we can more effectively encourage students to provide dissenting positions and provide evidence from both sides. Moreover, we can help students to make explicit their own assumptions as they evaluate those as well as others' assumptions. Because of this evaluation, program faculty plan to: 1) evaluate these questions as we refine our PLOs, assessment rubrics, and curriculum, and 2) publish PLOs and rubrics to make explicit and clear the goals of the program to students and others.

Table 2 shows data for PLO 5: Appreciation of differences.

Table 2: Appreciation of differences

Different Levels \ Two Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	(3.5)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Mean (N=8)
5.1: Cross-cultural	50%	13%	25%	13%				**3.50**
5.2: Diversity	13%		38%	25%	25%			**2.45**
OVERALL PLO 5	**31%**	**6%**	**31%**	**19%**	**13%**			**3.13**

Based on the rubric used to score appreciation of differences and intercultural knowledge and competency (Appendix C), a majority of the students demonstrated appreciation of differences. Specifically, PLO 5.1 concerns students' analysis of theory and evidence concerning perceptions of and multiple perspectives of outcomes in child development. Approximately 88% of our students demonstrated this competency.

Students' appreciation for diversity (PLO 5.2) was clear in half of our students. These students articulated insights into how culture creates individual differences in child development outcomes and how such knowledge can shape development across domains. The half not clearly articulating this idea cited evidence of cross-cultural differences but failed to clearly articulate an appreciation for and new insights about how such differences impact child development outcomes. Students were not explicitly asked to do so; thus this may not be a fair assessment of this outcome.

Overall, 67% of our students achieved 3 or greater in appreciation of differences across all measures assessed. Of the remaining students, every student achieved some milestone in development of this skill on all aspects assessed. Because students were assessed during their first year, they have continued opportunity for growth in this area.

As with the previous PLO discussed, a majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations for appreciation of differences, yet not *all* students are doing so. In part, this is expected because students are in their first year of the program and are still developing core skills. Also, as stated, the assignment evaluated was not explicitly designed to assess this PLO. This experience highlights the need to align PLOs, assessment rubrics, and assignments. Because of this evaluation, program faculty plan to: 1) evaluate these questions as we refine our PLOs, assessment rubrics, and curriculum, and 2) publish PLOs and rubrics to make explicit and clear the goals of the program to students and others.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [_____PLO 3 Critical thinking_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_____PLO 5 Appreciation of differences_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

 [NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Question 4 (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**? [___2___]

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**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q4.4**)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Theses and projects were submitted for program approval prior to graduation. Theses are original research studies, including a Literature Review to present an argument for the study as well as detailed information about the study. Projects involve creation of a product to benefit children or families. They also involve extensive literature review to present an argument for the need for the project as well as evaluation of the utility of the project. The Introduction, Literature Review, and Discussion chapters (similar across theses and projects) were used for this assessment. A sample of 8 randomly selected theses and projects submitted during the 2013-2014 academic year were used for this assessment.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s**)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion**?**

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? **[Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only**]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
X	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

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?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (there was one reviewer)
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We evaluated a random selection of thesis/project submissions during the 2013-2014 academic year. There were 11 submissions in total.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.5)**

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.6)**

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(Go to Q4.7)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.7)**

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

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? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Students enrolled in CHDV 290 to learn the guidelines for the thesis or project, and students enrolled in CHDV 504 to complete the assignment under the guidance of their sponsor. Students may complete their thesis or project during the semester of CHDV 504 enrollment or maintain continuous enrollment to complete their project in a later semester. Theses/projects are a reliable measure of critical thinking because it is a consistent measure across years of graduation, sponsors,, and student with a detailed handbook guiding students on expectations and requirements. One measure in place to maintain reliability is the requirement of program approval. Further, although thesis and project formats differ, both require demonstration of critical thinking in similar ways through the literature review and discussion chapters used for evaluating PLO 3. Theses/projects are a valid measure of critical thinking. To generate a new idea, either for a study (thesis) or application of empirical evidence (project), requires critical thinking. Moreover, in the discussion chapter, students integrate the outcomes of their work with current studies and provide insight for future work in the field. This all requires critical thinking in the ways evaluated using the rubric for PLO 3.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [___1___]
NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

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?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses				x	
2. Modifying curriculum			x		
3. Improving advising and mentoring				x	
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	x				
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	x				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan		x			
7. Annual assessment reports		x			
8. Program review					x
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					x
12. Program accreditation					x
13. External accountability reporting requirement					x
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					x
15. Strategic planning					x
16. Institutional benchmarking					x
17. Academic policy development or modification					x
18. Institutional Improvement					x
19. Resource allocation and budgeting				x	
20. New faculty hiring				x	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff				x	
22. Other Specify: changing program assessment practices X					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

- We continued revision of program learning outcomes to be more concise and precise, revising 4 learning outcomes that were too broad to 6 specific outcomes that match the mission of the program and college.
- To assess learning outcomes, we are evaluating already existing assignments rather than creating new assignments. This provides us with more data as well as a more externally valid assessment measure.

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 (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q5.3)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q5.3)**

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? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

- Elicit ongoing submission of assignments for assessment.
- Further refine program learning outcomes.
- At this point, a rubric exists only to assess PLO 3 and 5. The PLO 5 rubric needs to be refined. We need to develop specific rubrics for each learning outcome and develop the plan of assessment further. As learning outcomes are defined and rubrics developed, curriculum will necessitate revision.
- Assignments to be used for assessment purposes need to be aligned with PLOs and assessment plans.
- PLOs need to be published for students and others.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to **assess but not included above:** a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014 (but need to further develop)
	9. Have not yet **developed** a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
X	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [__504/505_____]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [__Child Development Program_ ____]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [Graduate and Professional Studies in Education – College of Education]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [_Dr. Susan Heredia_____]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014:

[_1 from CHDV undergraduate and 1 from CHDV Graduate**]**

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
X	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):
A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [___1 BA]
A12.1. List all the name(s): [__Child Development_____]
A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__5_ ___]

- Elementary Pre-Credential
- Integrated Pre-Credential
- Early Development, Care and Education
- Social/Community
- Individualized

Master Degree Program(s):
A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__ _**1**__]
A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

- Master of Arts: Child Development (Applied Settings)
- Master of Arts: Child Development (Theory and Research)

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [___2___]

Credential Program(s):
A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [_____0__]
A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

Doctorate Program(s)
A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [__0_____]
A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____
16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____
   - Master of Arts: Child Development (Applied Settings)
   - Master of Arts: Child Development (Theory and Research)

Appendix A. Child Development Program Learning Outcomes

Below are the detailed Child Development Graduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

1. **Child Development graduate students are expected to demonstrate advanced understanding of child development theories, research methods, and applications** (**PLO 1: KNOWLEDGE**; adapted from Lumina Degree Profile). They will:
   1.1 Use child development theories to interpret and frame thinking about and application of published articles;
   1.2 Locate, read, and critique published articles in multiple domains of development;
   1.3 Articulate their sources; and
   1.4 Demonstrate linkages among theory, evidence, and practice within multiple contexts in the field of child development and related disciplines.
   1.5 Apply understanding of discipline-based knowledge, theory and research to analyze and reflect on children's experiences in a variety of contexts.

2. **Child development graduate students will create sustained, coherent arguments or explanations based on information from multiple sources and multiple domains of development** (**PLO 2: VERBAL COMMUNICATION**; adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE written communication). They will:
   2.1 Develop the ability to communicate orally effectively and with clarity;
   2.2 Demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task and focuses all elements of the work;
   2.3 Use relevant, credible, and compelling evidence to illustrate mastery of the subject and compose an argument;
   2.4 Demonstrate detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions specific to writing in the CHDV discipline, including organization, mechanics, presentation, APA format and style

3. **Child development graduate students will analyze and synthesize ideas and evidence in various child development domains** (**PLO 3: CRITICAL THINKING**; adapted from VALUE critical thinking and Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile). Students will:
   3.1 Demonstrate understanding of the framework and methodology of quantitative and qualitative research, including the ability to locate, understand, critique and report research findings;
   3.2 Clearly state the issue to be considered, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding;
   3.3 Gather information from reliable sources with enough evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis; viewpoints are questioned thoroughly;
   3.4 Systematically and methodically analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position;

3.5 Acknowledge limits to knowledge and sources, accounting for the complexities of an issue; and

3.6 Draw logical conclusions based on informed evaluation.

4. **Child development graduate students will demonstrate competence in using information technology to augment discipline-based knowledge and inquiry** (**PLO 4: INFORMATION LITERACY**; adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile). Students will:

    4.1 Employ a variety of technological resources (e.g., library databases: PsychInfo) to locate and evaluate appropriate empirical evidence to provide a basis for knowledge acquisition and professional decision making; and

    4.2 Access and utilize appropriate technological tools for data analysis (e.g., SPSS).

5. **Child development graduate students will value differences in personal experience, both as a driving force for child development and as a framework for understanding and approaching issues in child development** (**PLO 5: APPRECIATION OF DIFFERENCES**). Students will:

    5.3 Analyze theory and evidence concerning cross-cultural factors that influence children's development; and

    5.4 Articulate insights about and appreciation for individual differences in culture (including gender, social, ability, and language) and socialization and how they produce diversity and shape child development across domains.

6. **Child development graduate students will understand, articulate, and apply child development work to multiple contexts** (**PLO 6: APPLICATION**; adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE civic responsibility). They will:

    6.1 Demonstrate evidence of cultural knowledge and competence, including attitudes of understanding and respect for diverse individuals in academic and applied settings;

    6.2 Demonstrate evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diverse communities and cultures;

    6.3 Connect and extend knowledge (evidence and theories) from coursework and experiences in the child development field;

    6.4 Develop communication strategies to establish relationships that encourage civic action on behalf of youth and families; and

    6.5 Demonstrate ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve application of child development expertise.

Child development graduate students will analyze and synthesize ideas and evidence in various child development domains.

Criterion	Capstone = 4	Milestone= 3	Milestone =2	Benchmark = 1
3.1: Methods (Demonstrate understanding of the framework and methodology of quantitative and qualitative research, including the ability to locate, understand, critique and report research findings)	Identify, compile, and analyze a variety of empirical evidence from qualitative and quantitative research perspectives, and with clarity, describing how the research was conducted, how it can be used to better understand the issue in question, and how it can be further developed to address the issue.	Identify and compile limited evidence from qualitative and quantitative research perspectives. Describe how the research was conducted, how it can be used to understand the issue in question, and how it can be further developed to address the issue, although may lack clarity in description.	Identify and compile limited empirical evidence from qualitative *or* quantitative research perspectives. Describe how the research was conducted and how it can be used to better understand the issue in question, but lacks clarity and/or analysis.	Identify and compile limited evidence from qualitative *or* quantitative research perspectives. Describe how the research was conducted and perhaps in a limited manner, how it can be used to better understand the issue in question, but lacks clarity and/or analysis.
3.2: Clarity of issue (Clearly state the issue to be considered, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding)	Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/ or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
3.3: Evidence (Gather information from reliable sources with enough evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis; viewpoints are questioned thoroughly)	Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/ evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
3.4: Student's position (Systematically and methodically analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position)	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present Assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.

3.5: **Identify limitations** (Acknowledge limits to knowledge and sources, accounting for the complexities of an issue)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
3.6: **Conclusion/evaluate** (Draw logical conclusions based on informed evaluation)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

Appendix C: PLO 5 Appreciation of Differences Rubric

Child development graduate students will value differences in personal experience, both as a driving force for child development and as a framework for understanding and approaching issues in child development.

Criterion	Capstone = 4	Milestone= 3	Milestone =2	Benchmark = 1
5.1: Cross-cultural (Analyze theory and evidence concerning cross-cultural factors that influence children's development)	Interrelates aspects of culture and reflects on how groups perceive cultures. Consistently incorporates diverse and multiple cultural perspectives on child development. A theoretical framework is used, with clear and relevant evidence integrated, relating to comparison of more than one culture on an outcome in	Communicates an informed understanding of diversity within and between culture groups. A theoretical framework is described, with some evidence comparing cultures.	Identifies some culture traits characteristic of different regions of the United States and the world. Evidence is provided for a position comparing cultures, but theoretical framework is weak or absent.	Indicates a limited knowledge of the culture traits of others that is largely stereotypical. Theoretical framework or evidence are presented, but not in a manner that leads to clear comparison between cultures.

	child development.			
5.2: Diversity (Articulate insights about individual differences in culture and socialization and how they produce diversity and shape child development across domains)	Examines diversity issues and indicates evaluation of own and others' potential cultural biases. Evidence of potential influences of culture, gender, ability, language, and/or social skills on a specific developmental outcome is clearly presented. New ideas are articulated clearly as this evidence is analyzed. Demonstrates understanding and applications of evidence, incorporating multiple and diverse perspectives.	Evidence is clearly presented, but conclusions provide more summary than generation of new ideas. *How* child development is shaped by this evidence is not clearly addressed.	Evidence used to support ideas is described with moderate clarity. Ideas provide summary of published information rather than insight.	Adequate empirical evidence is not used to support ideas, although ideas are presented about individual differences and child development. Value of diversity is present, but not clearly articulated with evidence.