

## 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 checked="" 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 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.  |

**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)?

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

**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:

The Government Department has developed three Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) for both its Government and IR majors (See Appendix 1). This year we have assessed part of Program Learning Outcome 2 (PLO 2C). PLO 2c requires students to collect and analyze quantitative data. PLO 2c states:

Student demonstrates the ability to collect and analyze quantitative data. Student should have a clear hypothesis, collect appropriate data, specify their variables, interpret and present their results.

**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):  
Analyzing quantitative data.

**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

**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]**

We expect the average student performance to be 2.5 or above. We also expect our seniors and students close to graduation to score higher.

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

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 2. Information literacy                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 3. Written communication                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 4. Oral communication                            |
| <input checked="" 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			
2. In <b>ALL</b> 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	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?

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?

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?

1

**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]**

The data were collected in four sections of Govt 100 in the Fall 14 and Spring 15 semesters. Students turned in a final paper that required them to collect and analyze quantitative data. The instructor for the courses applied the rubric to each paper. Different instructors taught the fall and spring sections of the course. In total, 126 student papers were assessed. Only one instructor read each paper, but the instructors met with the assessment coordinator last fall to develop the rubric and discuss how it would be applied.

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

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

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]**

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 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:

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

Papers from Govt 100.

**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  
 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?

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?

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

**Q3.4.3.** Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?

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

<b>Q3.5.</b> How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? Three		<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)? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<b>Q3.6.</b> How did you <b>select</b> the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?  It was all students in our research methods course. All Government and IR majors must take this course.		<b>Q3.6.1.</b> How did you <b>decide</b> how many samples of student work to review?  We reviewed all students in these four courses.	
<b>Q3.6.2.</b> How many students were in the class or program? 126	<b>Q3.6.3.</b> How many samples of student work did you evaluate? all	<b>Q3.6.4.</b> Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? <input 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="" 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>Q3.7.3.</b> If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.		<b>Q3.7.4.</b> If surveys were used, what was the response rate?	
<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="" 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="" 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>			

**Q3.9.** Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

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?

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 1: Percentage of Students by Scores for All Government Students in Govt 100**

Sub Goals	Scores							N
	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
Hypothesis	0.0%	0.8%	15.1%	12.7%	55.6%	0.8%	15.1%	126
Methodology	2.4%	11.9%	19.0%	14.3%	42.9%	2.4%	7.1%	126
Interpretation	10.3%	6.3%	21.4%	15.1%	31.7%	3.2%	11.9%	126

**Table 2: Cumulative Percentage for All Government Students in Govt 100**

	Scores							N
	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
Hypothesis	100.0%	100.0%	99.2%	84.1%	71.4%	15.9%	15.1%	126
Methodology	100.0%	97.6%	85.7%	66.7%	52.4%	9.5%	7.1%	126
Interpretation	100.0%	89.7%	83.3%	61.9%	46.8%	15.1%	11.9%	126

**Table 3: Average Score by Academic Level**

	Hypothesis	Methods	Interpretation	N
Non-Senior	2.89	2.44	2.45	126
Senior	2.97	2.75	2.63	64
All Students	2.93	2.59	2.54	62

**Table 4: Average Score by Major**

	Hypothesis	Methods	Interpretatio	N
			n	
International Relations	2.9	2.43	2.43	45
Government	2.94	2.68	2.6	81
All	2.93	2.59	2.54	126

Our students are meeting some of the criteria set out in the rubric for Program Learning Objective 2c. The course assignment requires students to develop a hypothesis, develop and implement a research design and interpret the results. Tables 1 and 2 show the percentage of students for each score in the rubric (See Appendix for rubric). A score of three means students are meeting expectations. Most of our students were able to develop a testable hypothesis with 71.4% scoring 3 or higher. A little over half

were able to develop and explain an appropriate research design and a little less than half scored a 3 or higher in interpreting their results. Table3 shows the average score for all students was over 2.5 for all there criteria. We also see that Seniors did better than non-seniors showing that students do better as they get closer to graduation. The scores were similar for our two majors, but International Relations majors scored slightly lower. This is probably explained by the fact that a higher percentage of International Relations majors were non-seniors.

**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?

Students did better on some parts of the learning objectives than others. They were able to develop a hypothesis, but struggled more with research design and interpretation. This is not surprising because these are difficult skills that are hard to learn in one course. We are encouraged that more advanced students seem to do better on these skills, but we would like to see a higher percentage of students score 3 or above in the future.

We plan to discuss strategies for improving our students' research methods skills at our department retreat. One idea we will discuss is encouraging our students to take Govt 100 during their Junior year. Many of our students take Govt 100 as Seniors because we have kept these sections small and it is hard for students to enroll before they are Seniors. We have been offering more sections in recent years as a way to allow students to take it earlier. If students take this course earlier, then we can work on these skills in more advanced Govt courses. Allowing students to learn about research methodology early and then practice them later should help students improve on more difficult skills like interpretation.

Since we usually discuss assessment during our fall retreat, we do not yet know what changes we may make to our curriculum or advising based on this year's assessment.

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

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. **Did not meet** 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)?

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

**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]**

**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

**Q5.2.** 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					
2. Modifying curriculum					
3. Improving advising and mentoring					
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					
7. Annual assessment reports					
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					
12. Program accreditation					
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning					
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement					
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					
20. New faculty hiring					
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					
22. Recruitment of new students					

23. Other Specify:

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

## Additional Assessment Activities

**Q6.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

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

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <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 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 checked="" 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:<br>a.<br>b.<br>c. |

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

Appendix I: Assessment Goals and Curriculum Map

Appendix II: Quantitative Analysis Rubric

## Program Information

**P1.** Program/Concentration Name(s):  
Government and International Relations Majors in Government

**P2.** Program Director:



Department <b>P1.1.</b> Report Authors: James Cox		<b>P2.1.</b> Department Chair: Nancy Lapp								
<b>P3.</b> Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Government Department		<b>P4.</b> College: SSIS								
<b>P5.</b> Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See <a href="#">Department Fact Book 2014</a> by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 286 Government – 144 International Relations		<b>P6.</b> Program Type: <b>[Select only one]</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Credential <input 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: 3  <b>P7.1.</b> List all the name(s): Government International Relations Government/Journalism  <b>P7.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 3		<b>Master Degree Program(s):</b> <b>P8.</b> Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1  <b>P8.1.</b> List all the name(s): Government Masters  <b>P8.2.</b> How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1								
<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: 0  <b>P10.1.</b> 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
<b>P13.</b> Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								X		
<b>P14.</b> Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?									X	
<b>P15.</b> Does the program have any capstone class?									X	
<b>P16.</b> Does the program have ANY capstone project?									X	

### Assessing Other Program Learning Outcomes (Optional)

If your program assessed PLOs not reported above, please summarize your assessment activities in the table below. If you completed part of the assessment process, but not the full process (for example, you revised a PLO and developed a new rubric for measuring it), then put N/A in any boxes that do not apply.

**Report Assessment Activities on Additional PLOs Here**



