

**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]

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 1. Critical thinking  |
| <input checked="" 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, 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?

- |                                     |               |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Yes        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 2. No         |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 3. Don't know |

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

- |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 1. Yes                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2. No (Go to <b>Q1.5</b> )         |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 3. Don't know (Go to <b>Q1.5</b> ) |

**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?

- |                          |               |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Yes        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. No         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Don't know |

**Q1.5.** Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- |                                     |                                      |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Yes                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 2. No, but I know what the DQP is    |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 4. Don't know                        |

**Q1.6.** Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)? Yes

<p><b>Q1.2.</b> Please provide more detailed background information about <b>EACH PLO</b> you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were <b>explicitly</b> linked to the Sac State BLGs: The CHDV MA program identified 6 PLOs (Appendix A): knowledge, communication, critical thinking, information literacy, appreciation of differences, and application. The PLOs assessed this year were PLO 2: Communication, and PLO 4: Information literacy.</p> <p><b>Child development graduate students will create sustained, coherent arguments or explanations based on information from multiple sources and multiple domains of development (PLO 2: COMMUNICATION;</b> adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE written communication). They will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Show evidence of the ability to communicate effectively and with clarity;</li> <li>2.2 Demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task and focuses all elements of the work;</li> <li>2.3 Use relevant, credible, and compelling evidence to illustrate mastery of the subject and compose an argument;</li> <li>2.4 Demonstrate detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions specific to writing in the CHDV discipline, including organization, mechanics, presentation, APA format and style.</li> </ul> <p><b>Child development graduate students will demonstrate competence in evaluating the need for information, using information technology to augment discipline-based knowledge and inquiry, and using responsibly the information generated or gathered (PLO 4: INFORMATION LITERACY;</b> adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile). Students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1 Effectively define the types of information available and information yet needed;</li> <li>4.2 Employ a variety of technological resources (e.g., library databases: PsychInfo) to locate and evaluate appropriate empirical evidence to provide a basis for knowledge acquisition and professional decision making;</li> <li>4.3 Access and utilize appropriate technological tools for data analysis (e.g., SPSS); and</li> <li>4.4 Compile information in ethical manner according to the CHDV discipline.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Q1.2.1.</b> Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>1. Yes, for all PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>2. Yes, but for some PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>3. No rubrics for PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A, other (please specify):</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes, for all PLOs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Yes, but for some PLOs	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. No rubrics for PLOs	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A, other (please specify):
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes, for all PLOs								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Yes, but for some PLOs								
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. No rubrics for PLOs								
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

<p><b>Q 2.1.</b> 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):</p> <p>Communication</p>	<p><b>Q2.2.</b> Has the program developed or adopted <b>explicit</b> standards of performance for this PLO?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>1. Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>2. No</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>3. Don't know</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>4. N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes								
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No								
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know								
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. N/A								
<p><b>Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s)</b> and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: <b>[Word limit: 300]</b></p> <p>See Appendix B for rubric. The standard of performance is that 70% of our graduate students should score 3 or higher by the end of their second semester.</p>									

**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:                                       |

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X		
2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	X		
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	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:			

### Question 3: 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?

- |                                     |                            |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <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)        |

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2014-2015?

- |                                     |                            |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <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><b>Q3.1A.</b> How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?</p> <p>1</p>	<p><b>Q3.2A</b> 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)? <b>[Word limit: 300]</b></p> <p>Students are required to take 3 courses during their first year of enrollment. Data were collected from CHDV 247 during these students' second semester. The paper in 247 required students to take and defend a position based on related readings.</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)</b></p>		
<p><b>Q3.3.</b> Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to <b>Q3.7</b>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to <b>Q3.7</b>)</p>	<p><b>Q3.3.1.</b> Which of the following direct measures were used? <b>[Check all that apply]</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify:</p>	
<p><b>Q3.3.2.</b> Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.</p> <p>See Appendix D.</p>		
<p><b>Q3.4.</b> How was the data evaluated? <b>[Select only one]</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. <b>No</b> rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to <b>Q3.5</b>)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:</p>		
<p><b>Q3.4.1.</b> Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p><b>Q3.4.2.</b> Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p><b>Q3.4.3.</b> Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>
<p><b>Q3.5.</b> How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?</p> <p>5</p>	<p><b>Q3.5.1.</b> If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>	

<b>Q3.6.</b> How did you <b>select</b> the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? All students in their second semester with required prerequisites were assessed.		<b>Q3.6.1.</b> How did you <b>decide</b> how many samples of student work to review? Utilize maximum number of data points for reliability	
<b>Q3.6.2.</b> How many students were in the class or program? CHDV 247: 15 students enrolled	<b>Q3.6.3.</b> How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 10	<b>Q3.6.4.</b> Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<b>Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)</b>			
<b>Q3.7.</b> Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to <b>Q3.8</b> ) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		<b>Q3.7.1.</b> Which of the following indirect measures were used? <b>[Check all that apply]</b> <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:	
<b>Q3.7.2</b> If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?		<b>Q3.7.4.</b> If surveys were used, what was the response rate?	
<b>Q3.7.3.</b> If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.			
<b>Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)</b>			
<b>Q3.8.</b> Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to <b>Q3.8.2</b> ) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		<b>Q3.8.1.</b> 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:	
<b>Q3.8.2.</b> Were other measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to <b>Q3.9</b> ) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to <b>Q3.9</b> )		<b>Q3.8.3.</b> If other measures were used, please specify:	
<b>Q3D: Alignment and Quality</b>			
<b>Q3.9.</b> Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes		<b>Q3.9.1.</b> Were <b>ALL</b> the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. No	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know	<input 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]

**Table 1: Communication (selected PLO)**

Different Levels Four Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	(3.5)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Mean (N=10)
<b>2.1 Organization/Mechanics</b>	10% (1)	30% (3)	60% (6)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.25
<b>2.2 Context/Purpose</b>	40% (4)	40% (4)	20% (2)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.60
<b>2.3 Evidence</b>	40% (4)	30% (3)	30% (3)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.55
<b>2.4: Conventions</b>	30% (3)	40% (4)	30% (3)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.50
<b>OVERALL PLO 2</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.49</b>

**Table 2: Information Literacy (non-selected PLO)**

Different Levels Four Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	(3.5)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Bench mark (1)	Mean
<b>4.1 Evidence Gathering (N = 5)</b>	40% (2)	40% (2)	20% (1)	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.6
<b>4.2 Access and Evaluate (N = 5)</b>	20% (1)	20% (1)	40% (2)	0%	1 (20%)	0%	0%	3.1
<b>4.3 Analysis (N = 2)</b>	50% (1)	50% (1)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.75
<b>4.4: Ethics/Responsibility (N = 5)</b>	100% (5)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4
<b>OVERALL PLO 4</b>	<b>52.5%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.61</b>

**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?

Based on the rubric used to score communication (Appendix C), Table 1 illustrates 100% of the second semester students demonstrated competence at or above the program standard. In particular, the strongest majority of students demonstrated understanding of the context/audience/purpose (PLO 2.2), with 75% of students performing at or close to capstone expectations. Performance was strong in all areas, yet the area students showed weakest (albeit strong) performance was in use of organization and mechanics, where only 40% of students were at or close to capstone expectations.

The non-selected PLO 4, although not a focus of discussion here, warrants brief mention. PLO 4 was to be assessed using theses or projects submitted to satisfy the final MA requirement. Students may also choose an exam option that does not adequately assess PLO 4.3. Because only two finishing students chose the thesis/project option this year, only two were able to be evaluated for PLO 4.3 as planned with the expectation of 95% of finishing students meeting the capstone requirement for PLO 4. Although their performance was strong, a larger sample is needed for reliable assessment and either the PLO or assessment strategy must be changed in future assessments. Because of this low N and to provide a more adequate sample, a class research paper was randomly sampled from 15% of students in a required foundation course. This analysis yields useful findings that 95% of students scored at or above 3, on average, in the areas assessed by PLO 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4. Accessing relevant information and analyzing it for use was the most challenging task, with 20% scoring below our performance standard and only 20% meeting the capstone. This PLO is a part of multiple courses and faculty in those courses will use these findings to guide coursework and feedback.

The results from the selected PLO (Communication) lead to multiple conclusions. Students are meeting or exceeding expectations for communication prior to entering their second year in our program. Although writing and communication are an emphasis in this program, students demonstrate room to improve as they embark upon their culminating experience (thesis, project, or exam) after their first year. We already have a mechanism in place to assist

students in preparation and continued work on writing and communication in the CHDV 290/292 required course. These assessment data will inform instructors of this course regarding specifically which skills should be emphasized for successful completion of the program. It is also valuable information for instructors of the required first year courses, who provide weekly/biweekly feedback on writing. Although a labor intensive process for instructors, the results demonstrate the success of these techniques. It will be valuable to assess growth in this area by re-assessing the communication PLO 3 again next year, but using culminating projects and theses as direct evidence while re-assessing newer students in this same course.

Because of this evaluation, program faculty plan to: 1) continue to refine our PLOs, assessment rubrics, and curriculum, 2) publish PLOs and rubrics to make explicit and clear the goals of the program to students and others, 3) create a curriculum map endorsed by CHDV faculty to provide consensus on foci of different courses, and 4) incorporate continued intense writing feedback in final courses.

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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | 1. <b>Exceeded</b> expectation/standard          |
| <input type="checkbox"/>                   | 2. <b>Met</b> expectation/standard               |
| <input type="checkbox"/>                   | 3. <b>Partially</b> met expectation/standard     |
| <input type="checkbox"/>                   | 4. <b>Partially</b> met 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]**

Because of this evaluation, program faculty plan to: 1) continue to refine our PLOs, assessment rubrics, and curriculum, 2) publish PLOs and rubrics to make explicit and clear the goals of the program to students and others, 3) create a curriculum map endorsed by CHDV faculty to provide consensus on foci of different courses, and 4) incorporate continued intense writing feedback in final courses. Outcomes will be assessed by re-assessment of PLO 2 using both first and second year data in addition to including one additional PLO.

**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				<b>x</b>	
2. Modifying curriculum			<b>x</b>		
3. Improving advising and mentoring			<b>x</b>		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<b>x</b>				
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<b>x</b>				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<b>x</b>				
7. Annual assessment reports	<b>x</b>				
8. Program review			<b>x</b>		
9. Prospective student and family information				<b>x</b>	
10. Alumni communication			<b>x</b>		
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)			<b>x</b>		
12. Program accreditation			<b>x</b>		
13. External accountability reporting requirement					<b>x</b>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					<b>x</b>
15. Strategic planning			<b>x</b>		
16. Institutional benchmarking					<b>x</b>
17. Academic policy development or modification			<b>x</b>		
18. Institutional Improvement					<b>x</b>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting				<b>x</b>	
20. New faculty hiring				<b>x</b>	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff				<b>x</b>	
22. Recruitment of new students				<b>x</b>	
23. Other Specify:					



**Q5.2.1.** Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

Presented information to faculty regarding PLOs, rubrics, and student outcomes. The majority of our focus has been global/programmatic. For example, we have worked on modifying PLOs and rubrics and aligning our curriculum with these goals. One outcome was to eliminate concentrations within the degree to better represent the program to students. Second, we streamlined intense work on writing and communication in the discipline by omitting a general college wide class to require students to focus writing efforts specifically within their field. Moreover, our exam option and preparation are undergoing significant revision with discussion ongoing.

### **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]**

n/a

**Q7.** What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <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 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: |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | a.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | b.  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | c.  |

**Q8.** Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

Appendix A: CHDV MA PLOs

Appendix B: Rubric for PLO 2

Appendix C: Rubric for PLO 4

Appendix D: CHDV 247: Assignment used to assess PLO 2, second semester students

## Program Information

**P1.** Program/Concentration Name(s):

Child Development MA

**P2.** Program Director:

Kristen Weede Alexander

**P1.1.** Report Authors:

Kristen Weede Alexander

**P2.1.** Department Chair:

Sue Heredia

**P3.** Academic unit: Department, Program, or College:

Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

**P4.** College:

Education

**P5.** Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See [Department Fact Book 2014](#) by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 34

**P6.** Program Type: **[Select only one]**

- |                                     |                                      |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 2. Credential                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Master's degree                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d)            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 5. Other. Please specify:            |

<b>Undergraduate Degree Program(s):</b> <b>P7.</b> Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 0  <b>P7.1.</b> List all the name(s):  <b>P7.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?				<b>Master Degree Program(s):</b> <b>P8.</b> Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has:  <b>P8.1.</b> List all the name(s):  <b>P8.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program?						
<b>Credential Program(s):</b> <b>P9.</b> Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0  <b>P9.1.</b> List all the names:				<b>Doctorate Program(s)</b> <b>P10.</b> Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 1  <b>P10.1.</b> List all the name(s): EDD						
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		

## Appendix A. Child Development Program Learning Outcomes

Below are the detailed Child Development Graduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

1. **Child Development graduate students are expected to demonstrate advanced understanding of child development theories, research methods, and applications (PLO 1: KNOWLEDGE;** adapted from Lumina Degree Profile). They will:
  - 1.1 Use child development theories to interpret and frame thinking about and application of published articles;
  - 1.2 Locate, read, and critique published articles in multiple domains of development;
  - 1.3 Articulate their sources; and
  - 1.4 Demonstrate linkages among theory, evidence, and practice within multiple contexts in the field of child development and related disciplines.
  - 1.5 Apply understanding of discipline-based knowledge, theory and research to analyze and reflect on children's experiences in a variety of contexts.
2. **Child development graduate students will create sustained, coherent arguments or explanations based on information from multiple sources and multiple domains of development (PLO 2: COMMUNICATION;** adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE written communication). They will:
  - 2.1 Develop the ability to communicate effectively and with clarity;
  - 2.2 Demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task and focuses all elements of the work;
  - 2.3 Use relevant, credible, and compelling evidence to illustrate mastery of the subject and compose an argument;
  - 2.4 Demonstrate detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions specific to writing in the CHDV discipline, including organization, mechanics, presentation, APA format and style
3. **Child development graduate students will analyze and synthesize ideas and evidence in various child development domains (PLO 3: CRITICAL THINKING;** adapted from VALUE critical thinking and Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile). Students will:
  - 3.1 Demonstrate understanding of the framework and methodology of quantitative and qualitative research, including the ability to locate, understand, critique and report research findings;
  - 3.2 Clearly state the issue to be considered, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding;
  - 3.3 Gather information from reliable sources with enough evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis; viewpoints are questioned thoroughly;
  - 3.4 Systematically and methodically analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position;
  - 3.5 Acknowledge limits to knowledge and sources, accounting for the complexities of an issue; and
  - 3.6 Draw logical conclusions based on informed evaluation.
4. **Child development graduate students will demonstrate competence in evaluating the need for information, using information technology to augment discipline-based knowledge and inquiry, and using responsibly the information generated or gathered (PLO 4: INFORMATION LITERACY;** adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile). Students will:
  - 4.1 Effectively define the types of information available and information yet needed;
  - 4.2 Employ a variety of technological resources (e.g., library databases: PsychInfo) to locate and evaluate appropriate empirical evidence to provide a basis for knowledge acquisition and professional decision making;
  - 4.3 Access and utilize appropriate technological tools for data analysis (e.g., SPSS); and

4.4 Compile information in ethical manner according to the CHDV discipline.

5. **Child development graduate students will value differences in personal experience, both as a driving force for child development and as a framework for understanding and approaching issues in child development (PLO 5: APPRECIATION OF DIFFERENCES).** Students will:
  - 5.1 Analyze theory and evidence concerning cross-cultural factors that influence children's development; and
  - 5.2 Articulate insights about and appreciation for individual differences in culture (including gender, social, ability, and language) and socialization and how they produce diversity and shape child development across domains.
6. **Child development graduate students will understand, articulate, and apply child development work to multiple contexts (PLO 6: APPLICATION; adapted from Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile and VALUE civic responsibility).** They will:
  - 6.1 Demonstrate evidence of cultural knowledge and competence, including attitudes of understanding and respect for diverse individuals in academic and applied settings;
  - 6.2 Demonstrate evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diverse communities and cultures;
  - 6.3 Connect and extend knowledge (evidence and theories) from coursework and experiences in the child development field;
  - 6.4 Develop communication strategies to establish relationships that encourage civic action on behalf of youth and families; and
  - 6.5 Demonstrate ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve application of child development expertise.

## Appendix B: PLO 2 Rubric (Communication)

**Child development graduate students will create sustained, coherent arguments or explanations based on information from multiple sources and multiple domains of development**

Criterion	Capstone = 4	Milestone= 3	Milestone =2	Benchmark = 1
<b>2.1: Organization and Mechanics</b> (Develop the ability to communicate effectively and with clarity)	Uses formal 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 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.
<b>2.2: Context and Purpose</b> (Demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task and focuses all elements of the work)	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).
<b>2.3: Sources and Evidence</b> (Use relevant, credible, and compelling evidence to illustrate mastery of the subject and compose an argument)	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.
<b>2.4: Disciplinary Conventions</b> (Demonstrate detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions specific to writing in the CHDV discipline, including organization, mechanics, presentation, APA format and style)	Demonstrate detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions specific to writing in the CHDV discipline, including organization, mechanics, presentation, APA format and style	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to the CHDV discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and style	Follows expectations appropriate to CHDV and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.

## Appendix C: PLO 4 Rubric (Information Literacy)

**Child development graduate students will demonstrate competence in evaluating the need for information, using information technology to augment discipline-based knowledge and inquiry, and using responsibly the information generated or gathered**

Criterion	Capstone = 4	Milestone= 3	Milestone =2	Benchmark = 1
<b>4.1: Evidence Gathering</b> (Effectively define the types of information available and information yet needed)	Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question.	Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.
<b>4.2: Access and Evaluate Evidence</b> (Employ a variety of technological resources (e.g., library databases: PsychInfo) to locate and evaluate appropriate empirical evidence to provide a basis for knowledge acquisition and professional decision making)	Use effective and varied search strategies, choosing a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering credibility, currency, etc.	Use varied search strategies with ability to refine search. Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria.	Uses simple search strategies using limited or similar sources. Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency.)	Access information randomly without regard for relevance or quality. Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question.)
<b>4.3: Data Analysis</b> (Access and utilize appropriate technological tools for data analysis (e.g., SPSS))	Uses available software to analyze and summarize qualitative or quantitative data. Can fit new ideas into existing literature and make explicit how these new ideas contribute to this literature.	Uses available software to analyze and summarize qualitative or quantitative data, with help identifying appropriate uses. Can fit new ideas into existing literature and make explicit how these new ideas contribute to this literature.	Requires assistance using available software to analyze and summarize qualitative or quantitative data, with help identifying appropriate uses. Begins to link new ideas with previous research and theory.	Requires assistance using available software to analyze and summarize qualitative or quantitative data, with help identifying appropriate uses. Does not show how new knowledge fits with previous knowledge.
<b>4.4: Ethics and Responsibility</b> (Compile information in ethical manner according to the CHDV discipline)	Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly one of the following (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

## Appendix D

Directions: This mini write should follow APA guidelines and you should include a title page and a reference page. The mini write should be 2-3 pages of text and 4-5 pages total. These mini writes will only be accepted through SacCT and must be submitted in a format that is compatible with word (e.g., .doc, .rtf, .docx) to receive full credit. This mini write is worth 25 points.

	Total Possible Points
Is APA correct? Note: This is an all or nothing score.	3
Grammar, Language Use	3
Quality of Integration of Reading and Lecture Material  Make it clear that you are integrating the course material. This does not mean to use an abundance of quotes but instead think about how the course material has helped to justify your argument. Ask yourself, what is the relevance of the course material to my argument?	9
How well is the argument written? Is the argument a logical argument? Are you detailed/specific? Is there evidence of critical thinking?  This is based on content. Do not simply describe your experiences but also analyze them. Make sure that your argument is logical...that there is a clear beginning, middle, and an end. Ask yourself... "Does my argument make sense?"	10
Total Points	25

Writing Prompt: Describe the American view of immigration. What may be some negative and/or positive results of these views and how do these views promote sense of self and success among children of immigration?