2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report Template v16

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
- [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.

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**)

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
- [X] 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. (Demonstrate, Use…)

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:	**Q1.2.1.** Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?
iMET program (MA in Educational Technology) has assessed program learning outcome 3 (**PLO 3)**: written communication skill. iMET students will demonstrate the development and expression of ideas in writing, learning to work in many genres and styles and working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Students' written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.: they will **(PLO 3: Written Communication** adopted from the VALUE rubric in Appendix I): 3.1: Clearly Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. **(3.1: Context of and Purpose for Writing)**. 3.2: Thoroughly Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. (**3.2: Content Development)** 3.3: Thoroughly 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 (**3.3: Genre and Disciplinary Conventions)**. 3.4: Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing (**3.4: Sources and Evidence);** 3.5: Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free. (**3.5: Control of Syntax and Mechanics).**	[X] 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):
iMet chose to assess the new PLO: written communication and used the review of literature in Master action research report (capstone project) as the direct measure to assessment this PLO.

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

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Don't know
- [ ] 4. N/A

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]**
65 % of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by the time of their graduation. (Please see Appendix I.)

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

- [ ] 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:

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 **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	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?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No (Skip to **Q6**)
- [ ] 3. Don't know (Skip to **Q6**)
- [ ] 4. N/A (Skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this 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**)

Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

One

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]**

Students in iMet program completed their Master thesis and eportfolio in EDTE 507: Culminating Experience. The VALUE written communication rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 8 students review of literature in their action research report from EDTE 507: Culminating Experiences Educational Technology offered in spring 2015. The program advising team is made up of t faculty members. The program coordinator determined the final scores for program assessment purpose. This is the first time that our graduate program has used written communication VALUE rubric to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our students' written communication skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students' written communication skill.

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

Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No (Go to **Q3.7**)
- [ ] 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

- [X] 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- [ ] 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- [ ] 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- [ ] 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as

Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.

Please see appendix II.

- [ ] simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
- [ ] 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
- [ ] 6. E-Portfolios
- [ ] 7. Other portfolios
- [ ] 8. Other measure. Specify:

Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? **[Select only one]**

- [ ] 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to **Q3.5**)
- [ ] 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
- [ ] 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
- [ ] 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
- [X] 5. The VALUE rubric(s)
- [ ] 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
- [ ] 7. Used other means. Specify:

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

Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Don't know
- [ ] 4. N/A

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

Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?

Two

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)?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3.6. How did you **select** the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?

We assessed 9 out of 9 students in this cohort.

Q3.6.1. How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Program faculty decided to assess all 9 out of 9 students' work.

Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?

Nine

Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?

Nine

Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- [ ] 1. Yes
- [X] 2. No (Skip to **Q3.8**)
- [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

- [ ] 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE)
- [ ] 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- [ ] 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:

Q3.7.2 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?

- [ ] 1. Yes
- [X] 2. No (Go to **Q3.8.2**)
- [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used?

- [ ] 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- [ ] 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.)
- [ ] 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.)
- [ ] 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- [ ] 1. Yes
- [X] 2. No (Go to **Q3.9**)
- [ ] 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?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Don't know

Q3.9.1. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

- [X] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 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 I: The Results for Written Communication Skill

Note: Data shown here drawn from Data Collection Sheet

Different Levels[2] / eria (Areas)[2]	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N
ext of and Purpose for Writing	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0%	(100%,
ent Development	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0%	(100%,
e and Disciplinary Conventions	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	0%	(100%,
ces and Evidence	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	0%	(100%,
rol of Syntax and Mechanics	0%	66.7%	33.3%	0%	(100%,

Standards of Performance for Education Technology (iMet) Graduate Students: *Sixty-five percent (65%) of our students will score 3.0 or above using the VALUE rubric by the time they graduate from the four semester program.*

Written Communication Data Collection Sheet

Different Levels[2] / Five Criteria (Areas) [2]	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Total (N=10)
3.1 Context of and Purpose for Writing	2	4	3	0	(N=9)
3.2 Content Development	2	4	3	0	(N=9
3.3 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions .	1	4	4	0	(N=9)
3.4 Sources and Evidence	1	4	4	0	(N=9)
3.5 Control of Syntax and Mechanics	0	6	3	0	(N=9)

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?

Written Communication Value Rubric

	Total % of Students Who score 3.0 or above	**Met the Standard or not?** **(Standard: 65 %** of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by the time of their graduation.)
3.1 Context of and Purpose for Writing	66.6%	Met
3.2 Content Development	66.6%	Met
3.3 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	55.5%	**Didn't Meet**
3.4 Sources and Evidence	55.5%	**Didn't Meet**
3.5 Control of Syntax and Mechanics	66.7%	Met

The key assessments analyzed here are students review of literature in thier action research report. Based on the standards and criteria from 3.1 to 3.5 in the written communication rubric in Appendix I, the majority of iMET students had appropriate written communication skills. Students meet the standards of 3.1 (66.6%), 3.2 (66.6%) and 3.5 (66.7%). Students do not meet the standards of 3.3 (55.5%) and 3.4 (55.5%). Students meet some of our written communication standards. The areas needing improvement: 1). 3.3: Genre and Disciplinary Conventions (55.5%) 2). 3.4: Source and Evidence (55.5%). In order to help students in our program successfully become better academic writers, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1). 3.3: Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and 3.4: Source and Evidence in EDTE 507 and EDTE 284 courses; 2). Require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments in iMet courses.

In conclusion, iMET students successfully met criteria 3.1: Context of and Purpose for Writing (66.6%), 3.2: Content Development (66.6%) and 3.5: Control of Syntax and Mechanics (66.7%). The areas for more improvement are 3.3: Genre and Disciplinary Conventions (55.5%) 2). 3.4: Source and Evidence (55.5%).

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

- [ ] 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- [ ] 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- [X] 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- [ ] 4. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- [ ] 5. No expectation or standard has been specified
- [ ] 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)?

- [X] 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?

- [X] 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]**

According to the assessment data, the following two areas need some improvement. The program faculty met and discussed the ways to address these two areas in the courses and key assignments (Review of Literature in Action Research Report). We will assess the this direct measure by using the same VALUE rubric.
1) 3.3: Genre and Disciplinary Conventions (55.5%)
2). 3.4: Source and Evidence (55.5%).

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					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning		**X**			
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement		**X**			
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					
20. New faculty hiring					
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.

1) iMET core faculty are in the process of modifying curriculum in iMET program and have used some assessment data from 2014-2015.
2) iMET core faculty are in the process of initiating Alumni advisory board and have used some assessment data from 2014-2015.
3) iMET core faculty have used the assessment data to create conversations about using AACU rubrics in core classes, improving our class room teaching, and developing the program curriculum map.

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
	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
X	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:

Appendix I: Written Communication Value Rubric
Appendix II: EDTE 507 Literature Review component of the Culminating Experience

Program Information

P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): MA in Educational Technology (iMET) **P1.1.** Report Authors: Chia-Jung Chung	**P2.** Program Director: Chia-Jung Chung **P2.1.** Department Chair: Dr. Susan M 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:* 17	**P6.** Program Type: **[Select only one]** [ ] 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major [ ] 2. Credential [X] 3. Master's degree [ ] 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) [ ] 5. Other. Please specify:
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): **P7.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: **P7.1.** List all the name(s): **P7.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?	***Master Degree Program(s):*** **P8.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 30 **P8.1.** List all the name(s): **P8.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program?
Credential Program(s): **P9.** Number of credential programs the academic unit has: **P9.1.** List all the names:	***Doctorate Program(s)*** **P10.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: **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									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	

Attachment II: Simplified Annual Assessment Report

Basic Assessment

Q1. Program Learning Outcome	**Q2.** Standards of Performance/Target Expectations	**Q3.** Methods/ Measures (Assignments) and Surveys	**Q4.** Data/Findings/ Conclusion	**Q5.** Use of Assessment Data/ Closing the Loop

Examples:

Chemistry, BS/BA

(Example of Content Knowledge)

PLO 1: Students will quantitatively determine the composition of chemical unknowns through the use of classical and modern analytical techniques and instrumentation.	Target performance for this assessment was that 50% of students would demonstrate "mastery" (i.e., reported values within 0.5% of the true value) and 75% of students would demonstrate "proficiency" (i.e., reported values within 1.0% of the true value).	Students were provided with nine chemical samples and quantitatively analyzed each unknown to determine their respective weight percent of chloride in a solid.	Findings were 44% mastery and 56% proficiency.	To close the loop, faculty has implemented additional opportunities for practice and achievement in analytical techniques and methodology in two core courses.

Educational Technology (iMet), MA

(Example of Complicated Skills)

PLO 1: <u>Critical Thinking Skills</u> **6.1** Explanation of issues **6.2** Evidence **6.3** Influence of context and assumptions **6.4** Student's position **6.5** Conclusions and related outcomes (See Appendix III)	Seventy percent (70 %) of our students will score 3.0 or above in all five dimensions using the VALUE rubric by the time they graduate from the four semester program.	Culminating Experience Projects: Master's Thesis	Students *meet* the standards 6.1 (92%), 6.4 (77%) and 6.5 (69%). Students *do not* meet the standards 6.2 (61%) and 6.3 (61%). **Students meet some of our Critical Thinking standards.** <u>The areas needing improvement</u>: 1). 6.2: Evidence (61%) 2). 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (61%).	In order to help students in our program successfully become critical thinking researchers, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1). Re-examination of evidence (6.2) and context and assumptions (6.3) in the research 2). Require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all

Attachment III: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the Educational Technology (iMet) Graduate Program

Table I: The Results for Critical Thinking Skill

Note: Data shown here drawn from Data Collection Sheet[1]

Different Levels[2] / Five Criteria (Areas)[2]	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N=10)
6.1: Explanation of issues	38%	54%	0%	8%	(100%, N=13)
6.2: Evidence	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=13)
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=13)
6.4: Student's position	23%	54%	8%	15%	(100%, N=13)
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes	15%	54%	15%	15%	(100%, N=13)

Standards of Performance for Education Technology (iMet) Graduate Students

Q2.3. If your program has an explicit standard(s) of performance for the selected PLO, describe the desired level of learning: *Seventy percent (70 %) of our students will score 3.0 or above using the VALUE rubric by the time they graduate from the four semester program.*

[1]Critical Thinking Data Collection Sheet

Different Levels[2] / Five Criteria (Areas)[2]	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Total (N=10)
6.1: Explanation of issues	5	7	0	1	(N=13)
6.2: Evidence	2	6	3	2	(N=13)
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	2	6	3	2	(N=13)
6.4: Student's position	3	7	1	2	(N=13)
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes	2	7	2	2	(N=13)

[2]Critical Thinking Value Rubric

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestone 3	Milestone 2	Benchmark 1
6.1: Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
6.2: Evidence *Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion*	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions).
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect students' informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

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	2	**Benchmark** 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing *Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).*	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 *Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).*	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.

Appendix II: Key Assessment for the iMET Program
EDTE 507 Literature Review component of the Culminating Experience

Purpose: One component of your culminating experience is to complete a review of the research literature on a topic related to your action research. This paper is expected to demonstrate greater maturity and understanding than any literature review you submitted at earlier in your graduate program.

Description of Requirement: Write a review of literature that thoroughly summarizes and evaluates key empirical research articles and other literature addressing your topic. Remember that a literature review is a piece of discursive prose, not a list describing or summarizing one piece of literature after another. Your aim should be to synthesize the material into a cohesive portrayal of where the research is at this point in time and how it can help in your research planning or education practice. The literature review should:

1) set the context with a clearly-articulated introduction that includes a statement of the problem, a brief explanation of the significance of your topic (to the education field and beyond, if applicable), an introduction to your definitions and background, and the theoretical framework for your paper;
2) demonstrate that you have thoroughly investigated the issue, collected and evaluated evidence from a variety of empirical sources and taken conflicting perspectives into consideration;
3) conform to APA guidelines for writing clearly and concisely (APA, Chapter 3) and address the mechanics of style (APA Chapter 4); and
4) be original and current (the narrative should be in your voice and the majority of research articles should have been published within the past seven years).

Format:

- This should be a 15 to 20 page, double-spaced paper in 12 point, Times New Roman or similar font with 1 inch margins all around. In addition, include a title page, abstract and references section. Appendixes are optional.
- Your paper should be formatted according to APA 6th edition guidelines, particularly with regards to headers, headings, citations, figures, tables and references.
- This is not a research report. It is a literature review. Recognize the distinctions of this genre and write accordingly. Follow the guidelines in the *Literature Review Template* below.

Submission: The finished draft should be submitted as an email attachment to your Culminating Experience advisor by 11:59 pm on January 23rd. After meeting with your advisor during on Jan. 27 or 28, upload the draft to your ePortfolio.

Evaluation: The **finished draft** will be evaluated based on the attached *Rubric for Literature Review.* You will not receive an actual letter grade but any component that falls below a 3 will need to be revised and re-evaluated. If a literature review does not meet passing standards you will receive a *No-Credit* for EDTE 507.

Literature Review Template

The template on the following pages will guide you through the essential steps to write up your literature review. It includes recommended headings following APA guidelines for papers with three levels of heading, but you might choose to use as few as two levels or as much as five. The choice is yours, provided you follow APA formatting as indicated below.

APA Headings	
Level	Format
1	**Centered, Boldface, Uppercase and Lowercase Headings**
2	**Left-aligned, Boldface, Uppercase and Lowercase Heading**
3	**Indented, boldface, lowercase heading with period.**
4	***Indented, boldface, italicized, lowercase heading with period.***
5	*Indented, italicized, lowercase heading with period.*

In general, the following *Conventions of style* in research and reporting should be followed:

- Title—should indicate clearly what report is about; limit to approximately 15 words or less
- Person and voice—typically written in third person point of view rather than the first person point of view or the passive voice
  The study showed that…, NOT I found out that….

  The participants responded…, NOT The participants have been asked….

- Tense—generally speaking, final reports written in past tense; proposals written in future tense
- Tentative versus definitive statements—*conclusions* usually reported with tentative statements; *procedures* and *results of descriptive analyses* can be stated more definitively
- Simplicity of language—use plain, straightforward language; don't try to impress your readers…let your research speak for itself! (differences in qualitative versus quantitative reports)
- Concise—condense the information when you can
- Consistency—consistency throughout the report is essential

The general format of your essay should:

- be typed, double-spaced, with two spaces after punctuation between sentences
- on standard-sized paper (8.5"x11")
- with 1" margins on all sides
- in 12 pt. Times New Roman or a similar font
- include a page header (title) in the upper left- hand of every page and a page number in the upper right-hand side of every page

Potential organization based on 3 levels of headings (You will decide on the actual titles for your headings):

Paper Title (This is your introduction section)

Review of Literature

Level 2 Heading

Level 2 Heading

Level 2 Heading

Level 3 heading.

Level 3 heading.

Level 2 Heading

Major Themes

Discussion

References

Appendixes

Much of the information in this template was excerpted from the OWL Purdue Online Writing Lab at http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/ and from Dr. Karen Davis-O'Hara, Associate Dean at Sacramento State University, California.