FOR GRADUATE AND CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS: THIS TEMPLATE REF THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT.	FERS TO SAC STATE BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS. PLEASE IGNORE			
Question 1: Progra	am 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] X 1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy	Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university? 1. Yes 2. No X 3. Don't know			
X 3. Written communication 4. Oral communication 5. Quantitative literacy 6. Inquiry and analysis 7. Creative thinking 8. Reading	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)			
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 X 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:	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 <u>Degree Qualification Profile</u> (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)? 1. Yes 2. No, but I know what the DQP is X 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. 4. Don't know			
a. b. c.	Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)? 1. Yes 2. No X 3. Don't know			
Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information ab above and other information such as how your specific PLOs we State BLGs:				
The Government Master's program has four Program Learning I). We assessed all four PLOs this year. These include:	Outcomes (PLO) (See Appendix 1. Yes, for all PLOs 2. Yes, but for some PLOs 3. No rubrics for PLOs N/A, other (please specify):			
Goal 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history and subfield in our program. These fields include International Rela California and its Political Environment.	d major debates of at least one			
Goal 2: Students will demonstrate an ability to describe, integral controversies in the field of Political Science.	ate and analyze major			
Goal 3: Students will demonstrate an ability to apply concepts f political issues.	from Political Science to current			
Goal 4: Students will demonstrate an ability to effectively comr arguments relating to Political Science.	municate concepts and			

In questions 2 through 5, report in detail on ONE PLO that	T YOU ASSESSED	ın 201 4	-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): See above.	Q2.2. Has the prog adopted explicit sta for this PLO? X 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A	ram deve	-	ance
Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have	developed for this	PLO he	re or in th	ne
appendix: [Word limit: 300] We expect the average student performance to be 3.0 or above.				
Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into. X				
Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and		Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7

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	Х	Х
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university 8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents		
9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation 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 23.1 Was assessment data (avidence collected for the selected DATA). If was was the data secret (avaluated for the selected DATA).	thic DIO is	2014
Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015? X	sessment se(s) or by [Word lim orehensive lasters deg sity takes an rubric and ore scored b mostly agre cores were	data what it: 300] exams ree. A n exam. scored by three eement
Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios) Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures ([Check all that apply])	were used	d?
x 1. Yes X 1. Capstone projects (including theses, ser	nior these	s),
2. No (Go to Q3.7)		"
3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7) 2. Key assignments from required classes in the control of the contr	in the pro	gram

Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select of	only one]	simulations, co 5. External per			
1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence of the control of	he faculty who teaches group of faculty	s the class			
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g.	Q3.4.2. Was the direct assignment, thesis, et	, •	Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?		
assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?	and explicitly with the		and explicitly with the PLO?		
x 1. Yes	x 1. Yes		x 1. Yes		
2. No 3. Don't know	2. No 3. Don't know		2. No 3. Don't know		
4. N/A	4. N/A		4. N/A		
		l			
Q3.5. How many faculty members participal assessment data collection of the selected P		Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was			
Three		scoring similarly)?			
		1. Yes x 2. No			
		x 2. No 3. Don't know			
Q3.6. How did you select the sample of stud	lent work [papers,		decide how many samples of student work		
projects, portfolios, etc.]?		to review?			
It was all students who took the comprehen 2015.	sive exam in Spring	See above.			
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the	Q3.6.3. How many sa	•	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student		
class or program?	work did you evaluate	e?	work for the direct measure adequate?		
, All			2. No		
			3. Don't know		
	-		interviews, etc.)		
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to asses 1. Yes	s the PLO?	Q3.7.1. Which of the [Check all that apply	following indirect measures were used?		
x 2. No (Skip to Q3.8)			ant surveys (e.g., NSSE)		
3. Don't know		2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)			
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sa	ample size decided?	3. College/Department/program student surveys 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews			

	6.	Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you select your sample.		Other, specify: If surveys were used, what was the response rate?
Q3C: Other Measures (extended	ernal bench ordized test	
licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? 1. Yes	 National disc General known 	e following measures were used? iplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams vledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) rdized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) y:
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? 1. Yes 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: Alig	gnment and	d Quality
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align PLO? X	gn with the the f	
Table 1: Percentage of Students by Scores for All Government	nent Students i	n Govt 100
Goal Aver	rage Score	
Goal 1: Knowledge of one subfield of Political Science Goal 2: Analysis Goal 3: Communication Goal 4: Application of Knowledge	3	.88 .00 .38 .48
Table 2: Percentage of Students by Scores for All Governn	nent Students i	n Govt 100
Goal Perc	ent Meeting Ex	pectations
Goal 1: Knowledge of one subfield of Political Science Goal 2: Analysis Goal 3: Communication Goal 4: Application of Knowledge	85. 71 100. 85.	4%

The average scores for seven students were determined by taking the average of three faculty raters' scores and then taking the average for all seven students. Since there were so few students take the exam, the percentages of students for each score are not reported. The average for all students was above three for three of the four goals. For Goal 1, Knowledge of one subfield, it was below 3 but only 1 of the seven students scored below 3. The students averaged three for Analysis (Goal 2), but scored higher on Communication and Application of Knowledge (Goals 3 and 4).
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?
Overall our graduate students are doing well meeting our goals. We were pleased with how students applied theories in political science to real world issues. We think our students have a good grasp of this. We would like to see students demonstrate a deeper knowledge of a subfield and be able to better analyze political research. However, students are meeting standards. This is the first year we have assessed our goals and we plan on holding a Graduate Committee meeting in the fall to discuss the results.
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) X 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]					
Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013 - 2014)	been used so	far? [Check all th	nat 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 ass	sessment data	a above.				
Additional Asses	sment A	ctivities				

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspec advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected here. [Word limit: 300]				
Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?				
X 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				
X 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 h	nere:			
Annual division Consumers at Master's Programs I counting Objectives				
Appendix I: Government Master's Program Learning Objectives				
Appendix II: Rubric for Government Masters Assessment				
••				
Program In	Tormation			
P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):	P2. Program Director:			
Government and International Relations Majors in Government	James Cox, Graduate Coordinator			

Department										
P1.1. Report Authors: James Cox				P2.1. Department Chair: Nancy Lapp						
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Government Department			P4.	College:						
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See <u>Department Fact</u> <u>Book 2014</u> by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment:			P6.	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major 2. Credential						
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 3				<i>ster Deg</i> Number	_		ee progr	ams the	acaden	nic unit has:
P7.1. List all the name(s): Government, GOVT/International Relations; GOVT/Journalism			P8.	P8.1. List all the name(s): Government Masters						
P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?			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: 0		P10	Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0							
P9.1. List all the names:			P10	P10.1. List all the name(s):						
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed									Х	
P12. Last updated									Х	
					1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know			
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?						Χ				
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?						Χ				
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?									Χ	
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?									Χ	

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