

2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report

Masters in Education: Behavioral Science Gender Equity and Curriculum & Instruction

FOR GRADUATE AND CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS: THIS TEMPLATE REFERS TO SAC STATE BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS. PLEASE IGNORE THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT.

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

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
- 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.

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Go to Q1.5)
- 3. Don't know (Go to Q1.5)

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
- 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 (Examined, describe, analyze, etc)

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

PLO #3 Written Communication: C & I and Gender Equity program has developed writing outcomes in various stages of students writing while in the program. Graduate students demonstrated an understanding of the PLO 3 Written Communication Value Rubric in Appendix 1, in the following course objectives:

Assessment Tool	PLO #3	When administered	Details about Administration
Assessment #1. Proposal for Culminating Experience	Demonstrates consistent use of content, focus to assigned task 3.1	During a course (EDTE 250) required in the third semester of the program	Course instructor and faculty advisor assess work based on a criteria designed by GPAG faculty
Assessment #2. Review of Literature	Uses credible, relevant sources to support ideas and genre of writing. 3.4	During a course (EDTE 290) in the penultimate semester of the program	Course instructor assesses work based on a standard rubric designed by GPAG faculty
Assessment #3. Culminating Experience*	Demonstrates appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of subject 4.3	During a course (EDTE 505/506) in the final semester of the program	Faculty advisors assess performance based on criteria designed by department and university

Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for 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

Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):

C & I and Gender Equity program assess Written Communication PLO#3 throughout the program courses, but specifically in the capstone course, EDTE 505/506 culminating experience. The C&I and Gender Equity culminating experience is a Project or Thesis consisting of:

- Abstract:** The basic components of the abstract includes elements such as: a welcome to the reader, an overview of the project or thesis components, an introduction to the navigation of the project or thesis, an introduction to the methodology involved, a reference to the documents, curriculum, professional development designed, a summary of data analyses, conclusions, limitations and recommendations.
- Process:** The process section of the project or thesis consists of a personal reflection of the students' experience of the C&I/Gender Equity programs and a resume. In addition, many students include a narrative of their teaching history and philosophy in this section.
- Products:** In the product section (appendices), students attach artifacts (products) created during their time in the program. Each product included in the product section must be accompanied by: a description of how the product was

Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
 4. N/A

conceived (what was the individual or group process that led to the creation of the product), a description of how technology and teaching strategies were utilized, standards covered by the use of the product, feedback on the product you have received from 2 peers and 1 faculty on your project, a copy of the professional development or grant, Human Subjects Ethical Approval when necessary, Letters of Informed Consent, copies of any Instruments used in data gathering

4. **Literature Review:** The goal of the literature review is to introduce readers to student research by synthesizing what has been written about the area of focus. It is also a place where students address the educational theories that motivated the design of the research. Ultimately, the review of literature should set the stage for the discussion of student research. Students must provide evidence that they have become masters of the literature base under study, have used a variety of sources, and can clearly add to the literature base by contributing something novel and useful, and write academically.
5. **Project Outcomes:** The objectives of the project may vary, yet all have in common a document that will be instructive to schools, teachers, principals, students or all of the above. The products are a culmination of the literature review, the recognition of what gap the study will remediate, the methodology and theory behind the construction of the document and the population the documents will ultimately benefit.
6. **Thesis Outcomes:** The objectives for the thesis are similar to the project, yet data is gathered, collected, organized, analyzed, interpreted and reported. The outcome of the thesis is to apply the findings in the educational settings students are involved with.

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: **[Word limit: 300]**

See Rubric for Literature Review APA Appendix A.

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other: |

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
--	-------------	-------------	-------------

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X	X	X
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	X		X
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 documents			
10. Other, specify: New student orientation presentation			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

<p>Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)</p>	<p>Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)</p>
---	--

<p>Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?</p> <p>Students work was assessed in three stages of our MA programs. Three essays were collected in three courses (EDUC 165, EDUC 251, EDUC 266) to assess students writing using Value Rubric for PLO 3. Of the nine writing assignments reviewed, seven were scored at capstone 4.1 level, one essay was scored at 3.3, and one essay was scored 1.3. The lower scored essay was a newly admitted MA student. The higher scored essays were both first year and second year MA students.</p>	<p>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 (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300]</p> <p>Writing paper samples were collected in EDUC 165, EDTE 251, and EDTE 266, core course in our MA programs. Faculty randomly selected essay assignment to be reviewed.</p>
---	---

Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)

<p>Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.7) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)</p>	<p>Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes</p>
---	--

<p>Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques <input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects <input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify:	
<p>Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one]</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:		
<p>Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	<p>Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	<p>Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A
<p>Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?</p>	<p>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)?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<p>Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?</p>	<p>Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?</p>	
<p>Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?</p>	<p>Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?</p>	<p>Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know
<p>Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)</p>		
<p>Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes	<p>Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/> 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. College/Department/program student surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other, specify:
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?	
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? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams <input type="checkbox"/> 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Other, specify:
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.9) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)	Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:

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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know
---	--

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III) [Word limit: 600 for selected PLO] The Graduate Program Area Group (GPAG), which is made up of faculty teaching in MA, Gender Equity and C & I, identifies its mission as providing opportunities for students to earn an M.A. in an educational area upon demonstration of having accomplished the following set of writing outcomes:

#5: Academic Writing	Knowledge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knows the conventions of a variety of academic genres (e.g. the teacher research report, the traditional journal article, the review of literature.)
	Skills	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Understands APA format and principles regulating titles and headings, documentations, and related matters.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can apply productive informal writing strategies as tools for learning and for research.
	Dispositions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Can compose academic prose for a variety of audiences including peers, professors, and the larger scholarly and professional community.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Welcomes participation in the academic discourse community.		

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?

C & I and Gender Equity programs are advanced degree programs for that provide a blend of knowledge, theory, and practical application in the real world. Teaching and learning beyond the walls of academia is inherent in these programs and College of Education’s mission. Faculty who teach in these MA programs are active in their areas of expertise, both in research writing and publication of scholarly work. They bring the practical experience of the real world into the University classroom, engaging in various writing genres, modeling professional ideals, and encouraging the best from the community of students involved in these programs. Student learning, writing, and the ongoing ability of students to utilize what they have learned in their professional lives, is the measure of our students success.

These programs have been designed to build on students writing skills. A student writing is assessed throughout the semester in each course. Our MA students work closely with the faculty member teaching our courses moving from benchmark skills to capstone skill (Value Rubric PLO 3) by the end of our programs. When students are writing their thesis/project, they receive constant feedback in order to help students demonstrate an understanding of writing at the graduate degree level.

Q4.3. For selected PLO, the student performance:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Exceeded expectation/standard |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2. Met expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Partially met expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Did not meet expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. No expectation or standard has been specified |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Don’t know |

Question 5: 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)?

1. Yes
 2. No (Go to **Q6**)
 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
 2. No
 3. Don't know

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. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

As part of the application process, students will submit examples of their writing so faculty can be better prepared to assist students with their writing if needed. In the future, more examples of students work will be collected and reviewed our PLO 3 goals. Students will also be required to submit their writing using a e-portfolio model, having students submit their writing in all courses in an electronic portfolio.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
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					
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 assessment data above.

Our faculty has used the assessment data to revise and strengthen our course curriculum, sequence of course delivery, and recruitment efforts and analysis.

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?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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:

Appendix A Rubric for Literature Review APA
 Appendix I Written Communication Value Rubric for PLO 3
 Attachment I: The Development of Program Learning Outcomes

Program Information

<p>P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): MA in Education, Curriculum & Instruction and Gender Equity</p> <p>P1.1. Report Authors: Sherrie Carinci</p>	<p>P2. Program Director: Sherrie Carinci</p> <p>P2.1. Department Chair: Sue Heredia</p>									
<p>P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: College of Education, Graduate Professional Programs</p>	<p>P4. College: College of Education</p>									
<p>P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 37</p>	<p>P6. Program Type: [Select only one]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Credential</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Master's degree</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other. Please specify:</p>									
<p>Undergraduate Degree Program(s):</p> <p>P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 0</p> <p>P7.1. List all the name(s):</p> <p>P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?</p>	<p>Master Degree Program(s):</p> <p>P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 2</p> <p>P8.1. List all the name(s): Behavioral Science, Gender Equity Curriculum & Instruction</p> <p>P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 0</p>									
<p>Credential Program(s):</p> <p>P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0</p> <p>P9.1. List all the names:</p>	<p>Doctorate Program(s)</p> <p>P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0</p> <p>P10.1. List all the name(s):</p>									
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								X		
P12. Last updated									X	

	1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?	X		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?	X		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?	X		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?	X		

Attachment I: The Development of Program Learning Outcomes

The Importance of Verbs

Multiple Interpretations:	Fewer Interpretations:
to grasp	to write
to know	to recite
to enjoy	to identify
to believe	to construct
to appreciate	to solve
to understand	to compare

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	

Rubric for Literature Review

Instructor Name

instructor@email.com • 404.531.4523 • Office hours 11:30AM - 1:30 Tue & Thur

(Scores are based on a preponderance of criteria for each category, not necessarily the presence of each criterion)

*American Psychological Association. (2010) The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.)

Washington, DC: Author. ISBN 9781433805622 **Criteria**

	Needs Improvement (1)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Score
<i>Guiding Question #1:</i> How well do the title, topic statement and introductory information orient the reader to the review?	a. There is no reference to the topic, educational field, or audience. b. There is no topic statement. c. The title is inappropriate and does not describe the topic.	a. The writer makes the reader aware of the overall issue, challenge, or topic to be examined. b. Topic is stated but clarity and/or focus could be better. c. The title does not adequately describe the topic.	a. The writer introduces the topic and the relevance to (1) the educational field. and (2) the chosen audience. The introduction lays groundwork for the direction of the paper. b. Topic is clearly stated and appropriately focused. c. The title is appropriate and adequately describes the topic.	Weight: 5% of paper grade.
<i>Guiding Question #2:</i> how well organized and structured is the review?	a. Information seems to be disorganized and has little to do with the main topic b. Develops ideas in one continuous chunk or in overlapping chunks or in sections not clearly marked. c. If sections are present, may have one or more sections with only one subheading. d. Outline of the hierarchy of ideas is not clear or marked by headings and subheadings. e. May present topics or ideas of equal importance at unequal heading levels or may not mark topics or ideas	a. There is a basic flow from one section to the next, but not all sections or paragraphs follow in a natural or logical order. b. Ideas are generally well developed, though there is some lack of clarity c. Develops most sections with either no subsections or at least two subsections (APA*, p.62) d. Outline of the hierarchy of ideas is generally clear but not always marked by headings and subheadings. e. Presentations of topics of equal importance.	a. The paper flows from general ideas to specific conclusions and/or vice-versa. All sections follow a logical order. Transitions tie together sections as well as individual paragraphs. b. Develops ideas in clearly marked sections c. Each section with either no subsections or at least two subsections (APA, p.62) d. Outlines the hierarchy of ideas in the review by using headings to convey the sequence and levels of importance (APA, p. 62)	Weight: 20% of paper grade

**Appendix I: Written Communication Value Rubric for PLO 3: Written Communication Skill
(Rubric to Assess The Review of Literature in Action Research Report)**

Written Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (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 the discipline 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, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful 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.

65 % of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by the time of their graduation.