

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: Asian Studies Program

B2. Report author(s): Greg Kim-Ju and Pattaratorn Chirapravati

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 43 Majors (38 Japanese concentration, 3 Chinese concentration, 2 South/Southeast Asian concentration) and five Minors.

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]

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| X | 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major |
| | 2. Credential |
| | 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) |
| 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 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:

In 2012-2013, the Asian Studies Program (ASP) developed a set of program learning outcomes applicable to its three concentrations as well as its minor. The four program learning outcomes include: a) Intercultural Knowledge and Competence in Asian Studies, b) Oral Communication in an Asian Language, c) Critical Thinking in Asian Studies, and d) Written Communication in Asian Studies. The decision to focus on these four program learning outcomes was based on meetings and consultations with ASP faculty members. In 2012-2013, ASP focused its assessment on Written Communication skills using the Association of American Colleges and University (AAC&U) Value Rubrics. Given the low sample size (N = 7) and a modified value rubric that is more detailed, we decided to again assess Written Communication in Asian Studies to establish a baseline for comparisons with future cohorts. In addition, we are assessing Critical Thinking in Asian Studies for this year’s assessment. Similar to 2012-2013, final papers submitted by students enrolled in Asia 198 (Spring 2014) will serve as the basis to evaluate Written Communication in Asian Studies. For Critical Thinking in Asian Studies, we are drawing on randomly selected reflection papers from students in the same course. Asia 198 is ASP’s capstone course and is designed to build on students’ analytic and written skills through writing assignments that collectively comprise 80% of their overall grade.

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. [We will implement within the next few years.] |
| | 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]

Given the small size of the Asian Studies Program and the low number of students enrolled in Asia 198 each year, we are still in the process of including an adequate sample size to establish expectations of performance for the Written Communication and Critical Thinking skills. However, using the two rubrics below, the expectation that at least 70% of the students in Asia 198 will be able to achieve a score of at least "3" averaged across all five categories for each rubric appears to be reasonable.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

| | Capstone 4 | Milestone 3 | Milestone 2 | Benchmark 1 |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of</i> | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned | Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins | Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <i>audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i> | responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. | task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). | to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). | (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience). |
| Content Development | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of Asian Studies and shape the whole work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. |
| Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i> | Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices. | Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices. | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation. | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. |
| Sources and Evidence | Demonstrates skillful use of high quality, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for Asian Studies and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates consistent use of relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within Asian Studies and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for Asian Studies and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. |
| Control of Syntax and Mechanics | Uses effective language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error free. | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors. | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors. | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

| | Capstone 4 | Milestone 3 | Milestone 2 | Benchmark* 1 |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Explanation of issues | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, and uses relevant | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and examined so that understanding is not seriously impeded by | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined and | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | information necessary for full understanding. | omissions. | ambiguities, and backgrounds unexplored. | |
| Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i> | Information is taken from source(s) with substantial interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent and comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are questioned thoroughly. | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are subject to questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Findings from the literature are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Findings from the literature are taken as fact without question. |
| 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 and questions own and others' assumptions. Evaluates several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies some assumptions but may be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). Identifies some relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Shows an emerging awareness of assumptions but sometimes labels assertions as assumptions. Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| Student's position (Perspective, thesis/hypothesis) | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is sophisticated, 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. |
| 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. |

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) |

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]

Written Communication Skills

Final papers assigned to students enrolled in Asia 198 were used to assess Written Communication Skills in Asian Studies. Using the Written Communication rubric above, two ASP faculty members (capstone Professor and another ASP faculty member) reviewed these papers and assigned points for each category. A review of the Asia 198 papers (N = 16) by these faculty members indicated mean scores ranging from 2.87 (Sources and Evidence) to 3.34 (Genre and Disciplinary Conventions). Over 70% of the students achieved a score of at least “3” on two categories (Content Development and Genre and Disciplinary Conventions) and nearly 70% of them did on two categories (Control of Syntax and Mechanics and Sources and Evidence). Less than 63% of the students achieved at least a “3” on Context of and Purpose for Writing and Sources. Inter-rater reliability for these items was a respectable .88.

| Category | Capstone 4 | Milestone 3 | Milestone 2 | Benchmark 1 | < Benchmark 0 | Mean (SD) |
|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Context | 43.8% | 18.8% | 37.6% | 0% | 0% | 3.19 (.83) |
| Content | 43.8% | 31.3% | 18.8% | 6.3% | 0% | 3.22 (.85) |
| Disciplinary | 50.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | 3.34 (.77) |
| Syntax | 50.0% | 18.8% | 31.3% | 0% | 0% | 3.31 (.79) |
| Sources | 12.5% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 2.87 (1.13) |

Critical Thinking Skills

Reflection papers assigned to students enrolled in Asia 198 were used to assess Critical Thinking skills. Students were asked to submit a weekly paper (2-3 pages) based on that week’s reading at the start of class. The following was the description of this assignment:

Your paper should briefly summarize the reading (is it biographical? theoretical? empirical?) and discuss the author’s point of view, the substance of the book and articles, and analyze how it fits into the course. You should also assess the strengths and weaknesses of the reading. You may occasionally quote or paraphrase the author to illustrate your own point. The first paragraph should identify the author, text, and year of the publication. You may answer the following: What is the author’s argument? Are the author’s views logical? Is the context explained? Why do you think the author wrote this? You should summarize your overall thoughts in a brief conclusion.

Using the Critical Thinking rubric above, two ASP faculty members (capstone Professor and ASP faculty member) reviewed randomly selected weekly reflection papers submitted over the course of the semester and assigned points for each category. A review of the reflection papers (N = 16) by these faculty members showed mean scores ranging from 3.00 (Evidence) to 3.31 (Explanation). Nearly 90% of the students achieved a score of at least “3” on two categories (Explanation and Position) and slightly over 81% achieved a score of at least “3” on Conclusion. Nearly 70% of the students achieved a score of at least “3” on Evidence and close to 63% of them did as well on Context. Inter-rater reliability for these items was .79.

| Category | Capstone 4 | Milestone 3 | Milestone 2 | Benchmark 1 | < Benchmark 0 | Mean (SD) |
|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| Explanation | 18.8% | 68.8% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | 3.31 (.54) |
| Evidence | 18.8% | 50.1% | 18.8% | 12.5% | 0% | 3.00 (.93) |
| Context | 25.0% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 0% | 3.13 (.72) |
| Position | 25.0% | 62.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | 3.25 (.62) |
| Conclusion | 25.0% | 56.3% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 0% | 3.22 (.73) |

Both of these sets of results suggest meaningful and reasonable student performance outcomes with respect to Written Communication and Critical Thinking in Asian Studies. However, we must keep in mind that the sample size for these learning outcomes is low, though it is representative of the number of students who typically enroll in this course in any given year.

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: [_____Written Communication_____]

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | 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: [_____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 |

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.**

| | |
|---|---|
| | 1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹ |
| | 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. 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]

Term paper

A short term paper (4-5 page double-spaced). Students are free to choose their own topic in the theme of Intra Asian Migration. Please consult with Professor Chirapravati on your topic. The term paper is due on the last day of class.

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

| | |
|---|---------------|
| X | 1. Yes |
| | 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?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 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 |
| X | 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?

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

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

| | |
|---|---------------|
| | 1. Yes |
| X | 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 selected and reviewed papers from the capstone course, Asia 198: Asia in the World Today, for a total of 16 papers for each program learning outcome.

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]

A key assignment used this year was a short-term paper (4-5 page, double-spaced) for Asia 198 designed to allow students to demonstrate their understanding of history, culture, economic and politics of least one country in Asia. In this capstone course, students are expected to pay attention to and to think critically about events that are currently unfolding in Asia. In the past two years, this course has been using the One World theme as part of its course. As such, paper themes involved Intra Asian Migration this year. The capstone professor and one other

ASP faculty member read the papers and scored them using the Written Communication value rubric described earlier. The two faculty members met to discuss the rubric and suggested any modifications to arrive at greater consistency in their assessment of papers. They then re-read the papers and adjusted their scores.

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 | | | 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.

Using the results from the 2012-2013 assessment and the feedback from this report, we made modifications to our assessment plan. For example, we made changes to the Written Communication LEAP value rubric to customize it to Asian Studies content. We are also considering indirect measures of program learning outcomes in addition to the direct measures utilized thus far. In particular, we are working on an exit survey for ASP students to measure some of our learning outcomes (see below).

Sacramento State Alumni Survey – Asian Studies Program

1. In what year did you graduate? _____

Please circle your response to the following questions.

2. What was the principal reason you chose Asian Studies as a major? (Choose one option)

- A. It was recommended to you by a friend.
- B. You enjoyed Asian Studies' course (or courses) you took.
- C. You had an interest in the subject matter.
- D. You thought it would help you get a job after graduation.
- E. Other:

3. In your opinion, courses in Asian Studies provided the opportunity to:

- A. Have a general exposure to Asian Studies' issues
- B. Understand a few issues related to Asian Studies.
- C. Understand to an extent, Asian experiences.
- D. Understand specific issues related to Asian.
- E. Understand a broad range of complex issues related to Asian experience.
- F. Other:

4. In your opinion, the courses offered in the Asian Studies Major were:
- A. Insufficient
 - B. Wish there were more courses
 - C. Sufficient courses, but not covering a broad range of issues.
 - D. Sufficient
 - E. Other:

5. Were the courses taught in Asian Studies offered:
- A. Too frequently
 - B. Not frequently enough
 - C. Other:

6. Were the course requirements of the Asian Studies major:
- A. Too restrictive to allow you to pursue your interest in your favorite concentration?
 - B. Somewhat too restrictive to allow you to pursue your interest in your favorite concentration?
 - C. Sufficiently broad in scope to acquaint you with your concentration?
 - D. Flexible enough to allow you to both learn about your concentration and take classes in your other favorite field?
 - E. No opinion/Don't recall

Please comment:

Please rate your level of satisfaction with aspects of the Asian Studies program addressed in the following questions.

7. The overall quality of instruction provided by the Asian Studies' faculty:
- A. Very satisfied
 - B. Satisfied
 - C. Neutral
 - D. Dissatisfied
 - E. Very dissatisfied
 - F. Not applicable

8. Your access to Asian Studies' faculty while studying at Sac State:

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Neutral
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied
- F. Not applicable

9. The intellectual challenge and inspiration you received from the field of Asian Studies:

- A. Very satisfied

- B. Satisfied
- C. Neutral
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied
- F. Not applicable

10. The ability of the Asian Studies Department to schedule classes that would allow you to graduate within a reasonable period of time:

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Neutral
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied
- F. Not applicable

11. The quality of advising:

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Neutral
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied
- F. Not applicable

12. Opportunities for fieldwork:

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Neutral
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied
- F. Not applicable

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

13. Majoring in Asian Studies has changed the way I look at the world (the things I notice, care about, think about).

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree
- F. No opinion

14. Which of the following best describes your career path since graduation? (Please choose all that apply)

- A. Work in private sector

- B. Law school
- C. Work in political job
- D. Teaching
- E. Work for local, state, federal, government
- F. Graduate school in government, political science, or public policy
- G. Other:

15. If you are currently employed, how important to your current employer is your degree in Asian Studies?

- A. Very important
- B. Somewhat important
- C. Slightly important
- D. Not important at all

16. What was your overall GPA at the time you graduated from Sac State?

- A. 4.00-3.75
- B. 3.74-3.50
- C. 3.49-3.25
- D. 3.24-3.00
- E. 2.99-2.75
- F. 2.74-2.50
- G. 2.49 or below

17. How many hours per week did you work while you were a major in the Asian Studies Department?

- A. 0-10
- B. 11-15
- C. 16-20
- D. 21-25
- E. 26-30
- F. over 30

18. What is your sex?

- A. Male
- B. Female

19. What is your age?

- A. 18-24
- B. 25-29
- C. 30-34
- D. 35-39
- E. Over 40

The following questions seek your comments. Please respond to them in your own words in the space provided.

20. Can you recommend ways that we can improve the Asian Studies major at Sac State?

21. In retrospect, what parts of the major did you find most interesting or useful?

22. How do you feel that your study of Asian Studies at Sac State has affected your ideas and beliefs?

23. Do you think that the Asian Studies major has prepared you for your career? If so, why? If not, why not?

24. Since graduation, which courses have proved to be the most useful in providing the tools necessary to succeed in the work you are doing today?

25. What would you consider to be your best or most positive experience with the Asian Studies Department program, courses, instruction, or staff?

Thank You for Your Participation!

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) |

Based on our results from this year, we will make more transparent the links between the assignments, especially the short-term papers, and course objectives and the use of rubrics. We modified the course objectives to reflect our focus on written communication and critical thinking using last year's assessment report and will continue make any necessary modifications. Furthermore, based on prior feedback in Asia 198 as well as alumni survey data, ASP decided to provide more options for topics on Asia. In this regard, ASP decided to develop a Korean concentration.

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]

The writing assignments for this course will remain but the relationship to course objectives will be made more explicit to students. Furthermore, we will include rubrics for students to review when receiving the course syllabus and assignments. We will assess these rubrics again next year with the same course. Programmatically, we will discuss with the ASP executive committee on how to incorporate written communication as a program learning outcome much earlier in our curriculum. This information may also be used to refine our curriculum map for 2-year and 4-year undergraduate students. Currently, we are having discussions about revising the ASP curriculum to include introductory and mid-level Asian Studies survey courses that emphasize written communication and other learning outcomes. As described earlier, we will also revise and implement an exit survey to indirectly measure these learning outcomes.

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

| | |
|---|---------------|
| X | 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) 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 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 8. 2013-2014 |
| X | 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?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 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: [___ASIA 198___]

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

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

A7. Name of the academic unit: [___Asian Studies Program___]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [___ Asian Studies Program___]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [___Pattaratorn Chirapravati___]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [___1___]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

| | |
|---|--|
| | 1. Arts and Letters |
| | 2. Business Administration |
| | 3. Education |
| | 4. Engineering and Computer Science |
| | 5. Health and Human Services |
| | 6. Natural Science and Mathematics |
| X | 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): [Asian Studies Major_____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [___3___]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [___0___]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

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

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: _____