THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT.	ers 10 SAC STATE DACCALAUREATE LEARNING GUALS. FLEASE IGNORE				
Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes					
Question 1. Progra Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2014-2015? [Check all that apply] 1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy 3. Written communication 4. Oral communication 5. Quantitative literacy 6. Inquiry and analysis 7. Creative thinking 8. Reading 9. Team work	Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)? 1. Yes X 2. No (Go to Q1.5) 3. Don't know (Go to Q1.5)				
X 10. Problem solving 11. Civic knowledge and engagement 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, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: a. b. c.	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? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know Q1.5. Did your program use the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)? 1. Yes 2. No, but I know what the DQP is X 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. 4. Don't know Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)? YES				
Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information ab above and other information such as how your specific PLOs we State BLGs: The MS CE program has four Program Educational Objectives (PEO = A. Succeed in professional employment at their chosen special geotechnical, structural, transportation, or water resources B. Identify, analyze, and solve complex practical civil engineer of specialty. C. Communicate effectively about technically complex engine professionals, decision makers, and the general public, in the second complex professionals.	your PLOs? PLO): Ity of environmental, sengineering. ing problems in their chosen field ering problems to peers, other your PLOs? 1. Yes, for all PLOs 2. Yes, but for some PLOs 3. No rubrics for PLOs N/A, other (please specify):				

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for	the selected	PLO		
assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):	Q2.2. Has the progradopted explicit stafor this PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A		•	ance
Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have develop	ed for this PLO here	or in the	appendix	: [Word
limit: 300]				
Standard of performance is 80% of student (overall/final) grades are a B- or better in graduate we	ork			
Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.	OTK.			
1. Critical thinking				
2. Information literacy				
3. Written communication				
4. Oral communication				
5. Quantitative literacy				
6. Inquiry and analysis				
7. Creative thinking				
8. Reading				
9. Team work				
X 10. Problem solving				
11. Civic knowledge and engagement				
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:				
Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and		Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
the rubric that measures the PLO:	-	,		
			(2) Standards of Performance	
			ard	S
		0	(2) Standards Performance	(3) Rubrics
		(1) PLO	Sts	Ru
		(1)	(2) Pe	(3)
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO				
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO				
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook				
4. In the university catalogue				
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters				
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities		Х		
7. In 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 do	ocuments			
10. Other, specify:				

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of							
Data Quality for the <u>Selected</u> PLO							
Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collect PLO in 2014-2015? X 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Q6) 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)	ted for the selected	Q3.2. If yes, was the 2015? X	kip to Q6)				
Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methodid you use to assess this PLO? One. Final grade in our graduate classes du		for the selected PLO.	be how you collected the assessment data For example, in what course(s) or by what lected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300]				
Q3A: Direct M	easures (key ass	signments, proje	ects, portfolios)				
Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignment portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.7) 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7) Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure yo data. Final grades in graduate classes		[Check all that apply] 1. Capstone procourses, or experiments 2. Key assignme 3. Key assignme 4. Classroom basimulations, cor 5. External performants 6. E-Portfolios 7. Other portfol	ents from required classes in the program ents from elective classes sed performance assessments such as inprehensive exams, critiques ormance assessments such as internships unity based projects				
Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one] X							
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A Q3.5. How many faculty members participa	Q3.4.2. Was the direct assignment, thesis, et and explicitly with the 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know X 4. N/A	tc.) aligned directly e rubric?	Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A as evaluated by multiple scorers, was there				
assessment data collection of the selected F			procedure to make sure everyone was				

This was not discussed by the faculty.		scoring similarly)? 1. Yes					
		X 2. No 3. Don't know					
Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers,		Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work					
projects, portfolios, etc.]?		to review?					
All grades selected		NA					
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the	Q3.6.3. How many sa						
class or program?	work did you evaluate	e <i>:</i>	work for the direct measure adequate? X 1. Yes				
About 50 in the MS program at various stages.	All classes		2. No				
		3. Don't know					
Q3B: Indirect M	easures (surveys	s, focus groups,	interviews, etc.)				
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to asses 1. Yes	s the PLO?	Q3.7.1. Which of the [Check all that apply	following indirect measures were used?				
X 2. No (Skip to Q3.8)		1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE)					
3. Don't know		2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)					
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sa	ample size decided?	3. College/Department/program 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. Other, specify:					
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected			re used, what was the response rate?				
your sample.							
Q3C: Other Mea	sures (external	benchmarking,	licensing exams,				
	standardize	d tests, etc.)					
Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data suc		ch of the following me					
licensing exams or standardized tests used t assess the PLO?		onal disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams eral knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.)					
1. Yes		er standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.)					
X 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) 3. Don't know	4. Othe	r, specify:					
5. Doll (kilow							
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess	s the PLO?	O3.8.3. If other meas	sures were used, please specify:				
1. Yes	1	Q 0.0.0					
X 2. No (Go to Q3.9)							
3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)							
	Q3D: Alignme	ent and Quality					
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct mea			LL the assessment				
different assessment tools/measures/methor	ous directly align with t	he tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?					

X 1. Yes	X 1. Yes						
2. No	2. No						
3. Don't know	3. Don't know						
Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions							
Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the ass [Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]	essment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III)						
The figures below show the grade distribution of all students who enrolled in an MS civil engineering class during Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. In Fall 2014, 83% of students received a grade of B- or better and in Spring 2015, 96% of students received							
30	40						
Freducy (count)	20 - 10 -						
0 A A- B+ B B- C+ and	0 A A- B+ B B- C+ and						
below	below						
Fall 2014	Spring 2015						
Fall 2014							
Fall 2014 Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average the 2014-2015 graduate offerings.	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average the 2014-2015 graduate offerings.	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average the 2014-2015 graduate offerings. Q4.3. For selected PLO, the student performance:	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average the 2014-2015 graduate offerings. Q4.3. For selected PLO, the student performance: X 1. Exceeded expectation/standard	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						
Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, he the selected PLO? Yes. Students are meeting the program standard as 90% of students, on average the 2014-2015 graduate offerings. Q4.3. For selected PLO, the student performance:	Spring 2015 ow will the program work to improve student performance of						

5. No expectation or standard has been specified

6. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessm	ent Data	(Closing	the Lo	on)			
Q5.1. As a result of the assessment effort in 2014-2015 and	Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your						
based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure,	program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a						
course content, or modification of PLOs)?	description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. [Word limit: 300 words]						
1. Yes	changes. [word limit: 300 words]						
I 	No significant changes						
X 2. No (Go to Q6)	No significant changes.						
3. Don't know (Go to Q6)	_						
Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes							
that you anticipate making?							
1. Yes							
X 2. No							
3. Don't know							
Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014)	been used so	far? [Check all th	at apply]				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(8)		
	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some	Not at all	N/A		
Improving specific courses	- IVIGET			х			
2. Modifying curriculum				Х			
3. Improving advising and mentoring				Х			
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				Х			
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations				Х			
6. Developing/updating assessment plan				Х			
7. Annual assessment reports				х			
8. Program review				х			
9. Prospective student and family information				х			
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. Recruitment of new students				X			
23. Other Specify:							
Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the as	rocemont data	a abovo					
Q3.2.1. Flease provide a detailed example of now you used the as	sessifient date	above.					

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 here. [Word limit: 300]						
Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?						
1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy X 3. Written communication 4. Oral communication 5. Quantitative literacy 6. Inquiry and analysis 7. Creative thinking 8. Reading 9. Team work 10. Problem solving 11. Civic knowledge and engagement 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, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: a. b. c.						
Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:						

	Pro	gram	Info	rmati	on					
P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):			P2	. Program	Directo	r:				
MS in Civil Engineering			Ed	Saad Merayyan (in 2014-2015) Ed Dammel (2015-2016)						
P1.1. Report Authors:				P2.1. Department Chair:						
Benjamin Fell (current chair)			Ke	van Shafiza	ideh (chai	r in 2014-	2015)			
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or	College:		P4	. College:						
Department of Civil Engineering				gineering a	nd Compi	uter Scien	ice			
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (Second			<u>ct</u> <u>P6</u>	. Program						
<u>Book 2014</u> by the Office of Institutional Resea	rch for fo	all 2014			ergradua	te bacca	laureate	major		
enrollment: Fall 2014 (from Fall 2015 Factbook): 58				2. Cred						
Fall 2014 (170111 Fall 2015 Factbook). 58			X		ter's deg					
					torate (Pl		-			
Undergraduate Degree Program(s):			0.4		er. Please					
P7. Number of undergraduate degree program	ns the ac	rademic		aster Deg Number	_		ee nrogr	ams the	academ	nic unit has:
unit has: 1	ns the ac	caaciiiic		1	OI WIGST	or 3 degr	ee progr	anis tric	acaacii	ne unit nus.
P7.1. List all the name(s): BS in Civil Engir	neering		Р8	.1. List all	the nam	e(s):	MS in 0	Civil Engi	neering	
P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 0			P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 5							
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0		P1	Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0							
P9.1. List all the names:		P10.1. List all the name(s):								
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed					Х					
P12. Last updated					Х					
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this	s program	1?							Χ	
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of studen			ident lea	arning occu	ırs in the	curriculun	n?		Χ	
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?								Х		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?										