

# 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

## Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** [ BS in Gerontology ]

**B2. Report author(s):** [ Cheryl Osborne ]

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:** [ 53 (F13 = 117) ]

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**]

	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
x	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 <b>assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:</b>

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

Since the inception of Gerontology's interdisciplinary Major in 1990, the Program has sought many additional ways to provide students with contemporary applied curricula and to measure their advancement. To this end, we aligned Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) with University Learning Goals based on ACCU/LEAP Learning Outcomes, and matched them with AACU VALUE Rubric criteria for Integrated Learning and Communication (Appendix A). The Integrative Learning Rubric was chosen as it addresses ways students apply many of the other key components of AACU other rubrics (ie written & oral communication, critical thinking, inquiry & analysis, overall knowledge in the discipline, teamwork, civic knowledge, creativity). Additionally we incorporated the national Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE) Program Standards and Core Competencies (Appendix B) into all major core courses. These competencies are measured at various times in various courses and are included in course objectives in the Capstone course (Appendix C).

During 2013-2014 we measured *all* PLO# 1-6 using the Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric incorporated in the assignment grading rubric (Appendix D), in the Capstone course Senior Project Presentation assignment.

**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 ( <b>If no, go to Q1.4</b> ) (but must acknowledged for following nat'l AGHE Standards for Gero Degree Programs)
	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?**

x	1. Yes (see above)
	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](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.)

x	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL</b> PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME</b> PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	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]

**Standard of performance and expectations:** 80% of the students earn > 74% on the assignments and reach milestone 3 or higher in the AACU Rubric (Integrative Learning [Appendix D]).

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

x	1. Yes
	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**]

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

**Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO****Q3.1.** Were 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, were 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]**

Capstone community project presentation scores incorporating the Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric were used to measure and assess Gerontology students' overall learning and performance scores on all PLOs for the gerontology program (Appendix A). Results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Results for Integrative Learning Ability**

Evaluation Criteria	Number of Students Performing in Each Category (N=16)													
	Capstone (Exceeds Expectation)		Milestone (Meets Expectation)		Milestone (Meets Expectation)		Milestone (Approaches Expectation)		Milestone (Approaches Expectation)		Benchmark (Below Expectation)		No evi- dence	Total Meeting Standard
	4		3.5		3		2.5		2		1		0	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Connections to Experience	0	0%	8	50%	6	38%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%		88%
2. Connections to Disciplines	0	0%	0	0%	4	25%	6	38%	5	31%	1	6%		25%
3. Transfer of Learning	0	0%	9	56%	5	31%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%		87%
4. Integrated Communication	0	0%	3	19%	10	63%	1	%	1	6%	1	6%		82%
5. Reflection & Self-Assessment	3	19%	12	75%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		100%

All six (6) gerontology program PLOs were assessed using the Integrated Learning VALUE Rubric standards and criteria from 1-5 as aligned and described in the Appendix A. The majority of students were able to connect and integrate knowledge, attitudes and skills into the final presentation of their (two semester) culminating project; demonstrating their acquisition and use of the abilities on this measure.

Spring 2014 is the second time this Value has been assessed (the first was S13). Historically, the overall assignment has remained the same since F12 however, this assessment cycle is the first time the Integrative Learning criteria have been assessed. S14 data showed that we met target: 87% of the students met or exceeded Milestone #3 with only 13% not meeting Milestone #3. Data demonstrated that the overall average scores for the presentation increased from 80 - 87% (S13 and S14). Specific evaluation criteria also showed increases: *experience connection* (83-88%), *transfer* (66-87%), *integrated communication* (80-82%), and *reflection & self-assessment* (99-100%). After analysis of S14 data, faculty deemed 5 of the 6 PLOs to be more than adequately met. One score however dropped dramatically: *connection to interdisciplinary discipline* (100-25%). After discussing and analyzing this, faculty decided that this drop may have been because more emphasis was placed on the interdisciplinary aspects across disciplines than in the past assessment. The presentation outline and template have since been modified to reflect this added emphasis needed in PLO (#1).

S13 analysis of scores resulted in only minor modifications in presentation instructions and inclusion of more discussion in Seminar regarding the criteria. Data suggested the need for earlier emphasis on additional ways to discuss transfer of knowledge and theories and interdisciplinary aspects more clearly in their presentation. To facilitate this, the faculty created a presentation template including the desired assignment points and incorporated more “spot checks” of presentation outlines earlier in the semester. Data from S14 presentations indicate these modifications were successful (except for the drop in the strengthened interdisciplinary focus). This will be addressed during the F14-S15 semesters.

**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: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Integrative Learning \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	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? [   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.**

	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
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
x	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 CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
x	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 Appendix E

**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)
x	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
	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**]

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:

The AACU Integrative Learning Rubric was used to score the presentation and measure the completion of the Program Objectives (GERO 131 – Capstone): F13 (n=10) & S14 (n=16). All students were included in the sample.

***Indirect Measures***

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

	1. Yes
x	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q4.5</b> )

**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 ( <b>If no, go to Q4.6</b> )

**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 ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**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 Integrative Learning VALUE rubric was used to collect data in order to directly assess 16 student presentations from the required capstone core course offered in Spring 2014. The assessment committee this semester was comprised of three faculty members in the course including the Program Director. Two of the members were involved in developing the assignment and grading rubrics and participated in the S13 data collection and analysis so are very familiar with the criteria and how it is judged. The third member was oriented to the AACU rubric and level descriptors of outcomes. Each of the three members observed and scored all 16 presentations. To determine the final scores, the group came together to discuss the similarities and differences of the scores. Where consensus was not reached on individual criteria, the scores were averaged and used as the final data.

This is the second time that our program has used this rubric to directly assess our capstone students' integrative skills. The sample size though small for both semesters is inclusive of all the students therefore representative of the student body. Comparisons between the two semesters have given us useable insights regarding integrative abilities that are crucial in gerontology practice when working with clients, families, and interdisciplinary professionals and staff members. We plan to continue to have components of the integrative learning paradigm infused in all our classes, especially the service learning and practicum courses.

**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**]

	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Quite a Bit (2)</b>	<b>Some (3)</b>	<b>Not at all (4)</b>	<b>Not Applicable (9)</b>
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					2010
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.

We have used assessment data in many ways as seen on the Q5.1 Table. Most significantly this past year, we have used these data to create conversations about incorporating (AACU) rubrics (in more courses)

for course as well as program evaluation. Faculty members in GERO 102 (*written & oral communication*), 121/221 (*written & oral communication*), 122/222 (*written & oral communication*), 130, & 131 (*integrative learning*) have completed this process and are doing minor modifications for F14.

We also used these data and the changes we made from 2012-2013 & 2013-2014 in discussions with potential candidates for our first full time tenure track position; explaining our current program, future plans, and program culture and expectations.

**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 ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
	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]

Faculty are beginning the process of incorporating other rubrics (*critical thinking*) in GERO 122 and 131 for S15 implementation. GERO 101 and 103 are service learning courses and are planning to have assignment grading rubrics that incorporate *integrative learning* criteria ready for Fall 14 and S15. Impact will be assessed at the end of the semester the rubric is implemented by course faculty; the assessment committee will assess critical thinking VALUE rubric at the end of S15 for the annual report. New or modified rubrics will be reviewed at the program faculty meetings in the Fall.

We believe that using the same foundational criteria and format will help students to better visualize what their education is about: the level of desired knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to become a well-educated and employable person and a safe productive gerontology practitioner. It will undoubtedly also assist faculty to be able to assess across the curriculum in order to better identify reoccurring student deficiencies and strengths in PLOs.

**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]

None collected

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

x	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
	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
x	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	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
x	6. 2011-2012
	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 but updating it
	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: [GERO 131 ]

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

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

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: [Gerontology]

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: [Gerontology]

**A9.** Department Chair’s Name: [Cheryl Osborne]

**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): [BS in Gerontology]

**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: [0]

**We do have 15 Special Masters students completing a masters in aging and \_\_\_\_\_.**

**A13.1.** List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

**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\*?

x	1. Yes (not sure – minor?)
	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: \_\_\_\_\_Minor\_\_\_\_\_

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: \_\_\_\_\_