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.

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: [_MA in Educational Technology (i-MET)_]

B2. Report author(s): [Chia-Jung Chung]

B3. Fall 2013 enrollment: [13]
Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional 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
	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.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

Although a set of learning outcomes (see Appendix I) exist for the i-MET program (MA in Educational Technology) the VALUE rubric was used to assess students' critical thinking skills (See Appendix II).

This year we assessed program learning outcome 1 (**PLO 1)**: critical thinking. Our goal was to have all i-MET students score a minimum of 3 out of 4 for each of the criterion noted in the VALUE rubric. The PLO 1 objectives noted below were adopted from the VALUE rubric in Appendix II):

6.1: Clearly state the issue/problem, which needs to be considered critically, comprehensively describe the issue/problem and deliver all relevant information (issues, texts and/or numerical data) necessary for a full understanding of the issue/problem **(Criterion 6.1: Explanation of issues)**;

6.2: Thoroughly interpret and evaluate the information taken from source(s) to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis (**Criterion 6.2: Evidence);**

6.3: Thoroughly analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position (**Criterion 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions)**;

6.4: Students' specific position (perspective, thesis, or hypothesis) takes into account the complexities (all sides) of an issue. Limits of position and others' points of view are acknowledged and synthesized within position (**Criterion 6.4: Student's position);**

6.5: Conclusions, consequences and implications are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order (**Criterion 6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes).**

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)?

	1. Yes
X	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.
X	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2)**
	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]

- Seventy percent (70 %) of our students will score **3.0 or above** using the VALUE rubic (Appendix II) by the time they graduate from the four semeter program.

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

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q3.1)**

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

X	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]

Data for the critical thinking PLO ability is presented in Table 1.

Table I: The Results for Critical Thinking Skill

Different Levels / Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N=10)
6.1: Explanation of issues	38%	54%	0%	8%	3.23 (100%, N=13)
6.2: Evidence	15%	46%	23%	15%	2.62 (100%, N=13)
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	15%	46%	23%	15%	2.62 (100%, N=13)
6.4: Student's position	23%	54%	8%	15%	2.84 (100%, N=13)
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes	15%	54%	15%	15%	2.46 (100%, N=13)

Different Levels / Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N=10)
6.1: Explanation of issues	5	7	0	1	3.23 (100%, N=13)
6.2: Evidence	2	6	3	2	2.62 (100%, N=13)
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	2	6	3	2	2.62 (100%, N=13)
6.4: Student's position	3	7	1	2	2.84 (100%, N=13)
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes	2	7	2	2	2.46 (100%, N=13)

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].

The key assessments analyzed were the Culminating Experience Projects: Master Thesis and e-portfolios. Students must submit both projects to successfully complete the program. Both projects were assessed using the VALUE rubric (Appendix II). The majority of i-MET students scored high (92%, the program goal was 70%) with an average of 3.23 for **Criterion 6.1.** The majority of their scores fell into the 3 to 4 range on the rubric.

The students did not meet the standards of performance with their presentation of evidence (**Criterion 6.2**) or the consideration of influence of contexts, limits or assumptions (**Criterion 6.3**). The average score for these two areas was similar, 2.62. Over 60% were able to identify their own assumptions, others' assumptions or relevant contexts when presenting a position (Criterion 6.3). An equal percentage of students (61%) provided enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis based on the sources (**Criterion 6.2**). Consequently, 61% met the standard performance in these two areas (**Criterion 6.2 and 6.3,** again, our goal was 70%). Our program faculty will continue working on these two areas.

For **Criterion 6.4,** 77% of iMETstudents were able to take into account the complexities of an issue and acknowledge others' points of view or the limits of their position when they developed or presented their position (perspective, thesis, or hypothesis). Thus, over 70% met the standard performance for Criterion 6.4. The average score was 2.77, which shows the need for improvement next year.

For **Criterion 6.5** the average score was 2.46. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of our students' conclusions (our goal, 70%) were logically tied to a diverse range of information, including opposing viewpoints and all the related outcomes (consequences and implications) were identified clearly. Although 69% met the standard of performance in this area, the need to improve in this area will be addressed with faculty for the fall semester.

In conclusion, i-MET students successfully met Criterion 6.1: Explanation of issues (92%) and 6.4: Student's position (77%), and scored near i-MET's goal of 70% for 6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (69%). The areas needing improvement are Criterions 6.2: Evidence (61%) and 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (62%).

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [_____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

[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.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_____]

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

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**? [1]

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
X	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]

See Appendices III and IV for more details.

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

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

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

X	1. Yes
	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
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
X	5. Use other means. Specify: The VALUE rubric(s)

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

X	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	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?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	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:

In 2014 all 13 students completing the i-MET program submitted a culminating experience project (Masters Thesis and e-portfolio).

Indirect Measures

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

X	1. Yes
	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
X	7. Others, specify: Poster Showcase

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]

The VALUE critical thinking rubric was used to collect data in order to directly assess 13 student master's theses and e-portfolios from EDTE 507: Culminating Experiences Educational Technology offered in spring 2014. The program advising team is made up of two faculty members.

This is the first time that our graduate program used a rubric (The VALUE rubric) to assess our students' critical thinking skills. This rubric provided us with the ability to better assess our students' work and to consider what curricula changes would benefit our students.

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?

X	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
X	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			X		
10. Alumni communication			X		
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:					

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

The iMET faculty is in the process of modifying curriculum for the program and has used some assessment data from the 2012-2013 report to guide them as make these changes.

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]

This is the first time the VALUE rubric was used to assess students' critical thinking skills (see Appendix II). The rubric helped us to think more critically about the substance of the students' work.

In 2013-2014, i-MET students successfully met Criterion 6.1: Explanation of issues (92%), 6.4: Student's position (77%) and 6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (69%). The areas for more improvement are 6.2: Evidence (61%) and 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (62%). In order to help our students successfully meet the goal for **Criterions 6.2: Evidence and 6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions** (this need was also noted in Q3.4), we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to the re-examination of evidence, context and assumptions in the research and require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments. Also, prior to the fall 2014 semester, faculty will meet to discuss the three points listed below:

- Reassess how critical thinking skills are addressed for all assignments within the program.
- Determine 2 ways students can demonstrate their use of critical thinking skills for each of the 5 criterions.
- Design or modify two assignments where students are expected to explicitly demonstrate critical thinking skills before they are asked to write their culminating experience projects.

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

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	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]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
X	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
	7. 2012-2013
X	8. 2013-2014
	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

X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

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

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

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

X	1. Yes
	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: [_____]

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

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

A7. Name of the academic unit: [i-MET]

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 M. Heredia]

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

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: [_0__**]**

A12.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [___ ___**]**

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 in Educational Technology_]
A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [__0____]

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*?

	1. Yes
X	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: _____

Appendix I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the iMET Program

Table One: Overview of Program Learning Outcomes for iMET

		iMET Program Learning Outcomes
#1: **Expertise**	**Knowledge**	
		☐Understands different models of curriculum design as well as the different schools of curriculum development.
		☐Understands different instructional models and corresponding derivatives and modifications.
	Skills	☐Uses technology to locate and access literature on curriculum and instruction.
		☐Reads and analyzes literature on curriculum and instruction
		☐Provides a theoretical framework for the coherence of all components in a curriculum, components being: student characteristics, content discipline, standards and frameworks, materials, instructional strategies, environment, and evaluation.
		☐Approaches knowledge as dynamic, not static.

	Dispositions	☐Becomes reflective professional able to evaluate policies and practices critically using research to support position
		☐Becomes empowered to make decisions on curriculum and instruction that meets the needs of students.
# 2: **Leader-ship/ Change Agent**	**Knowledge**	☐Understands the school as an American institution with a history of social inequity.
		☐Understands the nature of institutional change.
	Skills	☐Does a critical review and analysis of curricular issues and trends.
		☐Develops a logical argument as to changes that can be made in education through curriculum development and implementation.
	Dispositions	☐Collaborates with others in informing public about problems with schools.
		☐Takes the initiative in planning for an effective staff development on curriculum and instruction that is research based.
#3: **Intel-lectual Curiosity**	**Knowledge**	☐Understands how past and current political and economic factors (among others) affect curriculum development and its implementation
	Skills	☐Studies and questions existing curricular practices and looks for appropriate solutions.
		☐Assesses existing curriculum and its impact on student learning and overall goals of education.
	Dispositions	☐Values and problematizes the scientific method of gathering information and gaining knowledge.
		☐Takes a broad minded approach to curriculum issues and suspends closure.
	Knowledge	☐Knows the basic processes of experimental research and other quantitative methods.

#4: **Research:** **Qualitative and Quantitative**	**Skills**	☐Knows the principles of a variety of qualitative methods including ethnography, action research, and narrative research
		☐Can apply basic statistical tools to interpret numerical data
	Dispositions	☐Can apply principled qualitative data collection and analysis strategies and tools.
		☐Values the importance of using valid and reliable data collection tools. ☐Values the importance of making valid conclusions and inferences from data.
#5: **Academic Writing**	**Knowledge**	☐Knows the conventions of a variety of academic genres (e.g. the teacher research report, the traditional journal article, the review of literature.)
	Skills	☐Understands APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentations, and related matters.
		☐Can apply productive informal writing strategies as tools for learning and for research.
	Dispositions	☐Can compose academic prose for a variety of audiences including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community.
		☐Welcomes participation in the academic discourse community.
		☐Welcomes collaboration, peer review (in classrooms and out), vigorous and rigorous analysis of evidence.

Appendix II: Critical Thinking Value Rubric for PLO 6: Critical Thinking Skill

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestone 3	Milestone 2	Benchmark 1
6.1: Explanation of issues	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.
6.2: Evidence *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.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	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).
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	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.	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.
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	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.

Standards and Achievement Targets: 70 % of our first year graduate students should score **3 or above** by the time of their graduation.

Appendix III: Key Assessment for the iMET Program
Culminating Experience Report

Culminating Experience Report (Action Research Report): The main task in action research is to design and implement a study using data collection tools that will allow you to "show" the reader what happened during and as a result of your intervention. After collecting your data, you will sort through your findings, looking for bits of data that reveal some information pertinent to your study. You then look for relationships (patterns) between these bits or pieces. The patterns that emerge from a variety of sources such as things that happen, things that you observe, things that people say and things that you measure result in your findings (conclusions).

Suggested Headings for iMET Action Research Report

Title Page
Abstract
Introduction

Statement Of The Problem
Significance
Research Questions
Definitions

Review of Literature
Methods

Description of the Innovation/Intervention
Setting
Limitations/Delimitations of the Study
Data Collection
- **Types of data collected.**
- **Subjects.**
- **Variables.**
- **Steps taken.**

Data Analysis
- **Procedures.**
- **Validity and reliability.**

Findings
Discussion
References
Appendices

Appendix IV: Key Assessment for the iMET Program
ePortfolio

The iMET culminating experience is an ePortfolio consisting of:
1. **Abstract**: Simply put, the portfolio abstract is an introduction to your e-portfolio. The basic components of the abstract includes elements such as:
• a welcome to the reader
• an overview of the portfolio components
• an introduction to the navigation of the portfolio
2. **Process**: The process section of the portfolio consists of a personal reflection on your experience of the iMET program and a resume. In addition, many students include a narrative of their teaching history and philosophy in this section.
3. **Products:** In the product section of the portfolio, you link artifacts (products) you have created during your time in the program. Each product you include in the product section must be accompanied by:
• a description of how the product was conceived (what was the individual or group process that led to the creation of the product).
• a description of how technology and teaching strategies were utilized
• standards covered by the use of the product
• feedback on the product you have received from received 2 peers and 1 faculty on your project
• Most portfolio's contain at least 3-5 Artifacts
4. **Report: Literature Review and Action Research**
Literature Review: The goal of the literature review is to introduce your readers to your research by synthesizing for them what has been written about your area of focus. It is also a place where you address the educational theories that motivated the design of your research. Ultimately, the review of literature should set the stage for your discussion of your research. Also remember that, though you can use a variety of sources, it is very important to share primary sources of information.
Action Research: The main task in action research is to design and implement a study using data collection tools that will allow you to "show" the reader what happened during and as a result of your intervention. After collecting your data, you will sort through your findings, looking for bits of data that reveal some information pertinent to your study. You then look for relationships (patterns) between these bits or pieces. The patterns that emerge from a variety of sources such as things that happen, things that you observe, things that people say and things that you measure result in your findings (conclusions).
5. **Symposium: Electronic Poster and/or Webinar**