



Feedback for the 2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report
College of Education
School Psychology MA

Amy Liu, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Professor of Sociology

Chia-Jung Chung, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Associate Professor of Education

Judith Kusnick, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Geology

Elizabeth Strasser, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Anthropology

Fall 2015
California State University, Sacramento



California State University, Sacramento
Office of Academic Program Assessment
6000 J Street • Eureka Hall 203 • Sacramento, CA 95819-3709
(916) 278-2497
<http://www.csus.edu/programassessment>

I. Summary Memo to the Deans/Chairs/Program Directors

To: Dean, College of Education
From: Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Date: Fall 2015
Subject: Feedback for the 2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report
CC: Office of Academic Affairs

The 2014-2015 annual assessment reports are based on responses to the [2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report Template](#) prepared by the [Office of Academic Program Assessment](#) (OAPA). The feedback for the *2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report* is summarized below:

Section:	Details:
I	Summary Memo to Deans/Chairs/Program Directors
II	Detailed Feedback for the 2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report
III	Commendations and Recommendations
Appendix 1:	WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”
Appendix 2:	Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for the 21st Century & AAC&U’s 16 VALUE Rubrics
Appendix 3:	Important Considerations for Program Review and Assessment
Appendix 4:	Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes
Appendix 5:	Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review

We have used appropriate rubrics from WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) for guidance on effective assessment practices in several areas, including the quality of learning outcomes, assessment plans, methods/data/analysis, program review, and the use of assessment data for curricular improvement, academic planning, and budgeting. These rubrics were provided in appendices in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Annual Assessment Report*, and will not be repeated here.

We hope all the previous **feedback** reports that you have received in recent years from OAPA (2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014) in addition to the current one (2014-2015) will be used to help the academic unit (department, program, or college) determine the extent to which its current assessment system is adequate and what additional components or processes may need to be developed or improved for **all the degree programs** in the academic unit.

We would like to thank Dr. Don Taylor, Interim Assistant Vice President, and Academic Programs, Janett Torset, Kathy Mine, and our student assistants, Christian and Paul Schoenmann, for their support in this assessment review process.

If you have any questions or suggestions, please contact [Dr. Amy Liu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu) (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of OAPA.

Thank you.

II. Detailed Feedback for the 2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report Education School Psychology MA

Template Questions	Detailed Questions, Criteria, and Comments		
Q1: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2014-2015?	Yes	Written Communication Oral Communication Inquiry and Analysis Ethical Reasoning Overall Competencies in the Major
	Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about each PLO you check above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs?	Yes	
	Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?	1	Yes for all PLOs
	Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?	Yes	
	Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)? (If No or Don't know, skip to Q1.5)	Yes	
	Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?	Yes	
	Q1.5. Did your program use the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?	3	No I don't know what DQP is
	Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?	Yes	
Q2: Standards of Performance/Expectation for the Selected PLO	Q2.1. Specify one PLO as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):	Yes	Oral Communication
	Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO?	Yes	
	Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO:	Not Clear	There are no rubrics in the Appendix, only the three rubric items in Q2.3.
	Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.	Yes	Oral Communication
	Q2.5. Please indicate where you have published the PLO:	Yes	All course material and assessment material
	Q2.6. Please indicate where you have published the standard of performance:	Yes	All course material and assessment material
	Q2.7. Please indicate where you have published the rubric that measures the PLO:	Yes	All course material and assessment material and student handbook

Q3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO	Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015? (If No, Don't know, N/A, skip to Q6)	Yes	
	Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?	Yes	Four
	Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015? (If No, Don't know, N/A, skip to Q6)	Yes	
	Q3.2A. Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected?	Not Clear	This seems to be saying that the rubrics provided in Q2.3 are for EDS 243. If so, then where are the rubrics used for Field Work and Internship? Are they the same? Is there a rubric for the oral thesis defense?
Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects,	Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? (If No or Don't know, skip to Q3.7)	Yes	
	Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used?	Yes	Capstone projects, key assignments, classroom performance, external performance, and ePortfolios
	Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.	No	None of these things are actually attached except a description of the portfolio.
	Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? (If No, skip to Q3.5)	4	Rubric pilot-tested and refined by group of faculty
	Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?	Not Clear	Without seeing the measures, it's hard to judge.
	Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?	Not Clear	Without seeing the measures, it's hard to judge.
	Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?	Not Clear	The rubrics provided do not map directly onto the six points of the PLO.
	Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?	Yes	Four
	Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?	Yes	
	Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?	Not Clear	This is a description of the kinds of work used, but not a description of the sampling. How were specific pieces of student work chosen for analysis? Were all samples of student work in these categories reviewed? Some subset? How was the subset chosen?
	Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?	No	Does not explain the decision process.
	Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?	Yes	Fifty students
Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?	Not Clear	Five Is this five categories of student work? Five pieces of student work? Work in these categories from five students?	

	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?	Not Clear	Is 10% adequate?
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)	Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? (If No, skip to Q3.8)	Yes	Focus group (not survey)
	Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?	Yes	Alumni survey, interviews, focus groups
	Q3.7.2. If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?	N/A	
	Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.		
	Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?		
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)	Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? (If No, skip to Q3.8.2)	Yes	
	Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used?	Not Clear	National exams Does this mean that national exams were used in a class to determine the grade? Or that national exams were used to measure this PLO? If so, where are the results of those exams?
	Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? (If No or Don't Know, skip to Q3.9)	Yes	
	Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:	Not Clear	Required class participation Does this mean that class participation was used in a class to determine the grade? Or that class participation was used to measure this PLO? If so, explain how that class participation aligns with the PLO and how it was measured.
Q3D: Alignment and Quality	Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?	Not Clear	PLO-rubric mismatch
	Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?	Not Clear	PLO-rubric mismatch
Q4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions	Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions:	Not Clear	Only the rubric for the practicum (I assume this is EDS 243?) is presented in this report. The Fieldwork and Internship Team Skills rubric is not attached. The Portfolio is listed as a measure, but no rubric and no data are provided. Given the lack of context, it's hard to interpret what this data means.
	Q4.1a. Does the program explicitly assess the PLO?	Not Clear	The EDS 243 rubrics break the skills down into specific items, but it's not clear how these items map onto the six points of the PLO. In the absence of either the measure or the rubric for the Team Skills data, it's hard to know how much of that measure is communication and how much is other things. The oral defense confounds many PLOs into one measure, and so does not explicitly measure communication.

	Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?	Not Clear	Rated above average
	Q4.2a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion?	Not Clear	Program standard is unclear (% of students score above average). In the absence of a program performance standard, and given that these measures may be confounding several PLOs, it's difficult to say that the students are definitely above the standard for this specific PLO.
	Q4.3. Do students partially meet, meet, or exceed the program's standard of performance (Q2.2) based on their assessment data?	Not Clear	Flowchart is helpful.
	Q4.3a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome?	Not Clear	
Q5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)	Q5.1. As a result of the assessment effort in 2014-2015 and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)? (If No or Don't Know, skip to Q6)	No	
	Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes	Yes	Should be skipped ref 5.1
	Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?	N/A	
	Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014) been used so far?	Yes	Skipped 1-19, 20-23 (Skipped ref 5.1) This question asks about 2013-14 assessment data. It's a different question than Q5.1.
	Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.	Yes	Should be skipped ref 5.1 instead entered "submitted justification for hire"
Additional Assessment Activities	Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results	N/A	
	Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?	Yes	Written Communication
	Q8. Have you attached any appendices?	No	Fieldwork Evaluation Form Internship Evaluation Form 243 Assessment Forms 239 Syllabus These items are not attached except Portfolio description.
Summary	S1. Does the program follow the template by answering where applicable?	Partial	Did not attach direct measures and some rubrics.

	S2. Were the program's answers simple and clear?	Partial	Confusion between measures specified in various questions; claims indirect measures that are not referenced elsewhere.
	S3. Does the program assess the PLO using correct alignment of standard, rubric, and measure (Q2.3, Q4.1a)?	Not Clear	Program standard should be much clear (% of students score above average) Rubrics provided do not map onto the six points of the PLO. Other measures (Team Skills, oral thesis defense) confound PLOs.
	S4. Overall, do students partially meet, meet, or exceed program's standard of performance (Q2.2) based on consultant's review (Q4.1)?	Not Clear	Because of the mismatch between PLO, some measures and some rubrics, it's hard to say what the performance of students is on this specific PLO.

*Highlighted (close-ended) questions receive answers corresponding to assessment report answer.

Open-ended questions receive answers based on consultant remarks using consultant legend:

1) Yes; 2) Partially; 3) Don't Know; 4) No; 5) Not-Clear; 8) Not-Applicable; 9) Missing

III. Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations:

The program is commended for addressing the following areas well:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:

- Clearly articulated the PLOs: What students should know, value, and be able to do at or near graduation.
- Included professional accreditation standards in the PLOs.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- Used direct measures to assess student learning outcomes.
- Developed the rubric by a group of faculty in the program, not just by the faculty who teaches the class.

Data Collection and Presentation:

- Used some specific key assignment grades, not overall course grades, for assessment.

Overall

- Used a flowchart to clearly communicate the assessment process.

Recommendations:

As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to:-

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- Align the PLO, measure and rubric. Right now the six points of the PLO don't map well onto either the measures or the rubrics. If the current rubrics are serving well, the program might think about revising their PLOs to better reflect what they more specifically want their students to be able to do (e.g., instead of basing the PLO on the six levels of Blooms, use the same things you are measuring in the PLO: Ability to Provide Feedback in an Understandable Manner, Effective Response to Questions, etc.
- Avoid using measures that combine more than one PLO. For example the Team Skills rubric (not presented but we found it on your website) includes communication, leadership and discipline knowledge skills all in one measure. The oral defense is used by your program to measure multiple PLOs. You can still use these measures, but you will get more usable assessment data if drill down farther in the data. For example, you can disaggregate the Team Skills data into the communication items, the leadership item and the item on appropriate behavioral/academic goals. You could use a rubric to score the oral defense that breaks out communication skills from inquiry and analysis. That way you get richer data on what your students need improvement in.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:

- We suggest framing program standards of performance this way: "80% of students will score a score of 10 or above on the Ability to Provide Feedback rubric". Averages show how the students perform as a group, but do not give you a sense of how many students are not performing at the level you desire. High scorers can mask low scorers in averages.

Data Collection and Presentation:

- Please make sure it is easy to go from Q2.3, to Q 3.3.2, to Q4.1. There were inconsistencies here that made the report hard to follow.
- We were confused about the sample size. Please report how many pieces of work you analyzed for EACH measure.

It's clear from your data that your program is already doing a good job of producing well-qualified school psychologists. Our suggestions here are intended to help you better use your assessment data to find ways to continue to improve your program.

Appendix 1: WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”

<http://www.wascsenior.org/search/site/Rubrics%20combined>

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
1. Comprehensive List	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, and disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).	The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.	The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome.
2. Assessable Outcomes	Outcomes statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. “Statements understand scientific method” do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., “Graduates can write reports in APA style” or “Graduate can make original contributions to biological knowledge.”	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria statements such as rubrics, and have identified example of student performance at varying levels of each outcome.
3. Alignment	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.	Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.
4. Assessment Planning	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in current year.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
5. The Student Experience	Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere.	Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcome levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.

Appendix 2: Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for The 21st Century & AAC&U's 16 VALUE Rubrics

<http://www.csus.edu/wascaccreditation/Documents/Endnotes/E044.pdf>

1. **Competence in the Disciplines:** The ability to demonstrate the competencies and values listed below in *at least one major field of study* and to demonstrate informed understandings of other fields, drawing on the knowledge and skills of disciplines outside the major.
2. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World** through study in the *sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts*. Focused by engagement with big questions, contemporary and enduring.
3. **Intellectual and Practical Skills, including:** *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving*, practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance.
 - 3.1 [Critical thinking](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.2 [Information literacy](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.3 [Written communication](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.4 [Oral communication](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.5 [Quantitative literacy](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.6 [Inquiry and analysis](#) (Sixth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.7 [Creative thinking](#) (Seventh VALUE rubric)
 - 3.8 [Reading](#) (Eighth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.9 [Teamwork](#) (Ninth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.10 [Problem solving](#) (Tenth VALUE rubric)
4. **Personal and Social Responsibility (Values), including:** *civic knowledge and engagement—local and global, intercultural knowledge and competence**, *ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning* anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.
 - 4.1 [Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global](#) (Eleventh VALUE rubric)
 - 4.2 [Intercultural knowledge and competence](#) (Twelfth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.3 [Ethical reasoning](#) (Thirteenth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.4 [Foundations and skills for lifelong learning](#) (Fourteenth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.5 [Global Learning](#) (Fifteenth VALUE rubric)
5. **Integrative Learning ****, including: *synthesis and advanced accomplishment* across general and specialized studies.
 - a. [Integrative and applied learning](#) (Sixteen VALUE rubric)

All of the above are demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities (values) to new settings and complex problems.

**Understanding of and respect for those who are different from oneself and the ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.*

*** Interdisciplinary learning, learning communities, capstone or senior studies in the General Education program and/or in the major connecting learning goals with the content and practices of the educational programs including GE, departmental majors, the co-curriculum and assessments.*

Appendix 3: Important Considerations for Program Review & Assessment

Please keep the following questions in mind when you (program, department, or the college) assess student learning outcomes and improve the programs:

- 1) What are your program learning outcomes (PLOs): **what should your students know, value, and be able to do (at the time of graduation)?** Are the PLOs aligned closely with the missions and vision of the university and the college/department/program? Is each program learning outcome aligned closely with the curriculum, the key assignment, pedagogy, grading, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?
- 2) Is each PLO assessable? What **rubrics** are used to assess a particular program learning outcome? What are the explicit **criteria** and **standards of performance** for each outcome? Have you achieved the learning outcomes: **the standards near or at graduation?**
- 3) **What are the data, findings, and analyses for EACH program learning outcome? What is the quality of the data: how reliable and valid is the data?** Other than GPA, what data/evidences are used to determine whether your graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (BA/BS or MA/MS)? If two or more pieces of assessment data are used for each outcome, is the data consistent or contradictory?
- 4) Are these PLOs (together with the data and the standards of performance **near or at graduation**) able to demonstrate the **meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness** of your degree program?
- 5) **Who is going to use the data?** Are the data, findings, or analyses clearly presented so they are easy to understand and/or use? Is the data used only for the course or for the program where the data is collected, or is the data also used broadly for the curriculum, budgeting, or strategic planning at the department, the college, or the university?
- 6) **Are students aware of these learning outcomes?** Do they often use them to assess the learning outcomes themselves? Where are the program learning outcomes published for view, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs? Are they widely shared?
- 7) Has the program conducted **follow-up assessment** to evaluate the effectiveness of program changes made based on assessment data? **If yes, how effective are those changes to improve student learning and success?** If no, what is your plan to assess the effectiveness of those changes?
- 8) **Is there an assessment plan for each unit (program, department, or college)?** Have curriculum maps been developed? Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time such as within a six-year program review cycle? Is the plan sustainable in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Will the assessment plan be revised as needed?

Appendix 4: Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes
(Based on Bloom's Taxonomy)

Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
Cite	Arrange	Apply	Analyze	Arrange	Appraise
Define	Classify	Change	Appraise	Assemble	Assess
Describe	Convert	Compute	Break Down	Categorize	Choose
Identify	Describe	Construct	Calculate	Collect	Compare
Indicate	Defend	Demonstrate	Categorize	Combine	Conclude
Know	Diagram	Discover	Compare	Compile	Contrast
Label	Discuss	Dramatize	Contrast	Compose	Criticize
List	Distinguish	Employ	Criticize	Construct	Decide
Match	Estimate	Illustrate	Debate	Create	Discriminate
Memorize	Explain	Interpret	Determine	Design	Estimate
Name	Extend	Investigate	Diagram	Devise	Evaluate
Outline	Generalize	Manipulate	Differentiate	Explain	Explain
Recall	Give Examples	Modify	Discriminate	Formulate	Grade
Recognize	Infer	Operate	Distinguish	Generate	Interpret
Record	Locate	Organize	Examine	Manage	Judge
Relate	Outline	Practice	Experiment	Modify	Justify
Repeat	Paraphrase	Predict	Identify	Organizer	Measure
Reproduce	Predict	Prepare	Illustrate	Perform	Rate
Select	Report	Produce	Infer	Plan	Relate
State	Restate	Schedule	Inspect	Prepare	Revise
Underline	Review	Shop	Inventory	Produce	Score
	Suggest	Sketch	Outline	Propose	Select
	Summarize	Solve	Question	Rearrange	Summarize
	Translate	Translate	Relate	Reconstruct	Support
		Use	Select	Relate	Value
			Solve	Reorganize	
			Test	Revise	

Page 37: Adapted from Gronlund (1991).

Allen, Mary. 2004. "Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education". San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing, Part of Jossey-Bass.

Appendix 5: Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review

Ideally, academic program assessment and review at Sacramento State should be an ongoing process that facilitates continuous program improvement and includes the following areas¹:

Assessment Plan: Each program needs to develop a program assessment plan which contains the following elements: Program goals and learning outcomes, methods for assessing progress toward these outcomes, and a timetable. This plan should be updated annually or frequently.

Annual Program Assessment Report: Program learning outcomes (PLOs) should be directly aligned with course learning outcomes (CLOs) and the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals (UBLGs). Programs are asked to provide the Office of Academic Affairs with an annual report (annual assessment report -AAR) on program assessment activities that occurred during the past academic year. These reports should identify learning goals and outcomes that were targeted for program assessment, measures used to evaluate progress toward those outcomes, data and analysis, and changes made or planned in response to the results. Annual program assessment and the assessment reports provide a solid foundation and data for the six year program review at Sacramento State.

Program Review: Each department undertakes an extensive program review every six years. As part of the program review process, departments are asked to use annual program assessment data to evaluate how well students are meeting program learning outcomes and university learning goals.

Thus, each department in our university should have in place a system for collecting and using evidence to improve student learning. So far, not all departments have established program learning outcomes and/or approaches to assess learning for all degree programs; it is essential to make these expectations explicit. This will help departments and colleges to assure that every degree program has or will have in place a quality assurance system for assessing and tracking student learning, and use this information to improve their respective programs. Importantly, departments should also present learning expectations, data, findings, and analysis in a way that is easy to understand and/or to use by the faculty, students, administration, the general public, accreditation agencies, and policy-makers.

¹ Adapted from the information at <http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/>