

# 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](mailto: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:** [Criminal Justice\_\_\_\_\_]

**B2. Report author(s):** [Dr. Dan Okada \_\_\_\_\_]

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:** [\_\_1,724\_\_]

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]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master’s degree
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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]

	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
X	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:

Having selected Critical Thinking (WASC1) for the 2012-2013 Assessment period, the Division determined that an area of interest that spans a number of other program learning goals is Ethical Reasoning. While other Learning Outcomes are relevant, in order to articulate a statement concerning how any student processes information ethically, and what that process entails, s/he must be able to: provide relevant information (WASC 2, information literacy); and be able to competently articulate his/her process (WASC 3, written communication). Effective oral communication (WASC 4) is linked to WASC 2 and 3; while WASC 5 (quantitative literacy) is not a strong feature of the Criminal Justice curriculum.

**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
<b>x</b>	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q1.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q1.4)</b>

**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
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
<b>X</b>	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](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.)

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

**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]

Based on the Division's assessment from 2012-2013, faculty were encouraged to maintain the structure and emphasis recommended.

1) Regarding 'Competency in the Discipline', specific course learning objectives and discussion as to their relevance and rigor was conducted over the course of the

academic year (AY) via Division faculty cohorts. Cohorts met periodically over the course of the AY and perspectives and subject matter updates and evolutions incorporated into instructor perspectives.

2) Based on the identified PLO from AY2012-2013, critical thinking (as per Bloom’s taxonomy) was introduced and distributed throughout the curriculum. The purpose of this was to insure that the Division goal of ‘intellectual and practical skills’ was maintained. Writing assignments, individual instructor incorporation of course learning objective assessments into each class taught, and curriculum cohort discussions were conducted throughout the AY.

3) Values were assessed in CRJ 190, Critical Issues in Criminal Justice, the Division’s required Writing Intensive course which also ostensibly serves as the Division’s capstone class. In this class, Ethical Reasoning (via the AAC&U rubric) was assessed from a sample (n=57) of CRJ 190 students. This exercise will be discussed under Q3.

4) In assessing the Division’s emphasis on leadership and problem solving, passage of a C- or better in required courses like CRJ 101 (Introduction to Criminal Justice Research Methods and CRJ 160 (Justice and Public Safety Administration) demonstrate the Division’s commitment to encouraging leaders and examiners in Criminal Justice.

These and objectives that arise from the Long-Term Plan based on the PLO, along with natural and unforeseen interactions will continue to be the focus of assessment and review of the Division’s 6-year Program Review Cycle.

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

	1. Yes
x	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q3.1)</b>

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

	1. In <b>SOME course syllabi/assignments</b> in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL course syllabi/assignments</b> 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 <b>(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>
	4. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>

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

x	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>
	4. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Part 3)</b>

**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]**

In assessing Ethical Reasoning, the following assignment asked a sample of CRJ 190 students (n=57) to create a short (no more than 500 words) essay in response to one of the following 3 scenarios:

- 1) A death row rape-murderer's request to donate his kidney to his mother and harvest his other organs for others in need was rejected by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC) who ruled that the time necessary to prepare for a transplant surgery would interfere with the condemned's scheduled execution. . . . provide a discussion of the ethical concerns presented and discuss your reasoning as you defend any position of decide to take.
- 2) The New York City Police Department's Internal Affairs Division instituted an 'Integrity Detail', for the purpose of investigating and detecting charges of corruption or suspicion of corruption throughout the NYPD ranks. Officers assigned recognize that the specific purpose of their work is the catching/entrapping/monitoring of police officers in various acts of misfeasance and/or corruption. . . . Should a strategy like this be included in every law enforcement agency to insure that acts of corruption are reduced or even eliminated? . . .
- 3) A 14-year old honor student wrote, "Vote for Michael Jackson" on a number of street stop signs; an 11-year old called 911 after his mother locked him out of their house; and a 13-year old threw a piece of steak at his mother's boyfriend, what these juveniles then had in common was they were then referred to and processed through the Allegheny County juvenile court, found in need of services, and sent to one of several private detention facilities in Pennsylvania by two juvenile court judges who, in return for their decisions, were paid some \$2.6 million over a 5-year span by the facilities' owners. . . . Given your perspective, discuss the ethical issues surrounding this case.

Student essays were then randomly distributed to Assessment Committee members who evaluated each essay based on the following amended AAC&U Ethical Reasoning rubric.

	<b>Comprehension (1)</b>	<b>Analysis (2)</b>	<b>Synthesis (3)</b>	<b>Evaluation (4)</b>
<b>Ethical Issue Recognition</b>	Recognizes basic ethical issues, but may fail to fully describe complexity...	Recognize basic ethical issues; describes basic understanding of the complexities ...	Recognizes ethical issues presented in complex context, <i>or</i> is able to describe cross-relationships among issues.	Recognizes and is able to articulate ethical issues presented in complex context; recognizes and can describe cross-relationships among



**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.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	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
x	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 <b>(If no, go to Q4.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q4.4)</b>

**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 <b>CORE</b> 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]**

See Q3.3.

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
<input type="checkbox"/>	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]

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Use other means. Specify:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	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?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know



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

A convenience sample of CRJ 190 students (N= 290, n=57) from 2 of the 9 sections offered in Spring 2014 volunteered to participate in the Ethical Reasoning exercise identified in Q3.3. Therefore 19% of graduating seniors completed the essay.

**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]

The Ethical Reasoning value was assessed through an examination of an ethics related criminal justice scenario produced by senior-level (90% in their last undergraduate semester) Criminal Justice majors. Two sections of CRJ190 provided 57 respondents (19% of graduating Criminal Justice seniors). Students were instructed that their individual ethical reasoning ability would be assessed through their interpretation of criminal justice related controversies. Scenarios were distributed at the end of class on Wednesday and collected at the beginning of class the following Monday. Essays were then randomly distributed to the Assessment Committee members who had agreed on an amended rubric constructed by AAC&U. Each reviewer (4) received 10-15 essays, along with a copy of the prompt and the evaluation rubric. Scores were determined based on a single individual reading of each essay.

Obvious inter-reliability and beyond face validity issues abound. No standardized prompt was identified that could be compared to insure validity, and given the time constraints of this assessment, issues of reliability were impossible to manufacture. Future attempts at assessment should be based on an accepted Ethical Reasoning prompt, and administered at the beginning and end of the semester with essays graded by at least two reviewers. Given the random nature of student enrollment in any particular CRJ190 section, individual student participation is not seen to be a significant issue regarding representativeness of the quality of work.

**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?

X	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]

	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
--	------------------	--------------------	-------------	-------------------	-----------------------

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(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.

**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)?

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

**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]

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

	1. Yes
	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) <sup>1</sup>
	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
X	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 <b>assess but not included above:</b> 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
x	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> 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 <b>updated</b> 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?

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: [\_\_CRJ190\_\_\_\_]

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

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

A7. Name of the academic unit: [\_\_Criminal Justice \_\_]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [\_\_Criminal Justice\_ \_\_]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [\_\_Dr. Mary Maguire\_\_\_\_]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [\_\_2\_\_]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
x	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\_\_]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [\_\_Bachelor's of Science\_\_\_\_]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_0\_\_]

**Master Degree Program(s):**

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_1\_\_]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [\_\_Master's of Science\_\_\_\_]

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: [\_\_n/a\_\_\_\_]

**Doctorate Program(s)**

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_0\_\_]

A15.1. List the name(s): [\_\_n/a\_\_\_\_]

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: \_\_\_\_\_