

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 type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| | a. |
| | b. |
| | c. |

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

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

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

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

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

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

1. Yes
 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is.
 4. Don't know

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

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 Sociology Graduate Program has eight program learning outcomes (PLOs) (see Appendix 1). This academic year we assessed the Program Learning Outcome #8 (PLO): Inquiry and Analysis. Inquiry and Analysis involve *“a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.”* This PLO was measured along the following dimensions:

- 1) Identify a creative, focused, and manageable topic which addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of an issue.
- 2) Synthesize in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of views/approaches.
- 3) Skillfully develop all elements of a methodology or theoretical framework and synthesize appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks from across disciplines.
- 4) Organize and synthesize evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities.
- 5) State conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry or similarities.
- 6) Insightfully discuss limitations and implications of the study.

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):

See Appendix II

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

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

See Appendix II.

For the Academic Year 2014/2015, the Graduate Program Committee of Sociology assessed the Program Learning Objective of Inquiry and Analysis (PLO #8). A graduate student cohort was selected for this assessment: once while enrolled in SOC 214 and one semester later while enrolled in SOC 215. For each class (15-18 students enrolled), five student papers were randomly selected to assess the PLO. Students from SOC214 were given a pre-test at the beginning of the semester; and then at the beginning of SOC215, a post-test. The test consisted of an in-class writing assignment where students were asked to explain how they would research the effectiveness of a new teaching method in a biology class and also whether the new method affected students' identity as scientists.

The rubric used to measure the standard of performance covered various central components of inquiry and analysis, and included the following operationalized categories: ability to do a comprehensive scholarly literature review, clearly state a research question, relate theory to their research question and/or hypotheses, develop a research design that best addresses their research question, conceptualize/operationalize variables, and analyze findings in relation to the theoretical framework/existing research (see PLO matrix). Each PLO dimension above was measured with 1-4 scale with scores ranging from low performance (1) to high performance (4). Every paper, both pre and post tests, were evaluated by five faculty. Scores that differed beyond 2 points were discussed. Average scores on each rubric area were used for each student.

Every category measured saw an improvement: stating clear hypothesis went from 2 to 2.5, justifying appropriate methods from 2.5 to 2.7, describing data from 2.6 to 2.7, and conceptualizing variables from 2.1 to 2.7. In short, students improved their performance in the area of inquiry and analysis, and the largest improvement was observed in conceptualizing/operationalizing the variables and the least in elaborating the source of data.

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

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

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and

Q2.5

Q2.6

Q2.7

the rubric that measures the PLO:	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X	X	X
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X		
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook			
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters	X	X	X
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	X		
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

<p>Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)</p>	<p>Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2014-2015?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)</p>
<p>Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?</p> <p>One tool was used, though the rubrics for the standard of performance had 8 dimensions measured (see Appendix II).</p> <p>This is the first time our graduate program used the rubric to explicitly and directly assess students' inquiry and analytical skills.</p>	<p>Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300]</p> <p>For the Academic Year 2014/2015, the Graduate Program Committee of Sociology assessed the Program Learning Objective of Inquiry and Analysis (PLO #8). A graduate student cohort was selected for this assessment: once while enrolled in SOC 214 (Research Methods) and later, in SOC 215 (Data Analysis). For each class (15-18 students enrolled), five student papers were randomly selected to assess the PLO. Students from SOC214 were given a pre-test; and later in SOC215, a post-test. The test consisted of an in-class writing assignment where students were asked to explain how they would research the effectiveness of a new teaching method in a biology class and also whether the new method affected students' identity as scientists.</p>

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

<p>Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p>	<p>Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses),</p>
---	---

<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.7) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)	<input type="checkbox"/> courses, or experiences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques <input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects <input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify:	
Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. The measure consisted of an in-class writing assignment where students were asked to explain how they would research the effectiveness of a new teaching method in a biology class and also whether the new method affected students' identity as scientists.		
Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one] <input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:		
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A
Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? Four.	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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? The sample was drawn from classes (SOC 214 and 215) that are sequential and enroll a cohort of students. From a cohort of 15-18 students, five papers were randomly selected from each class for a total of 10 papers.	Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review? We needed a cohort of students that take the same classes, and these two courses provided us with a sample of students whose progress in inquiry and analysis could be measured.	
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? There are fifteen students in each class.	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 10	Q3.6.4. 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

Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)	
<p>Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	<p>Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <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:
<p>Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?</p>	<p>Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?</p>
<p>Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.</p>	
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)	
<p>Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	<p>Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used?</p> <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:
<p>Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.9) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)	<p>Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:</p>
Q3D: Alignment and Quality	
<p>Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	<p>Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <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] See below.

Inquiry & Analysis Skills (PLO #8)	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Average Score Scale 1-4, high score excels
Reviews scholarly literature to research question	NA				
Informs research question with theoretical framework	NA				
States clear hypothesis or research question	1.8	3	1.4	1.8	2
Chooses appropriate methods and/or statistical techniques	2.2	3	2.8	2.1	2.5
Describes Data Set/Source of Data	2	3.2	3	2.3	2.6
Explains Variables	1.4	3	2.4	1.8	2.1
Interprets results	NA				
Analyzes in Discussion	2.5				
AVERAGE TOTAL	2	3	2.4	2	2.3
Research/Inquiry Writing Skills (PLO #8)	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Average Score Scale 1-4, high score excels
Reviews scholarly literature to research question	NA				
Informs research question with theoretical framework	NA				
States clear hypothesis or research question	1.9	3.8	2.5	1.6	2.5
Chooses appropriate methods and/or statistical techniques	2.7	2.8	3.2	2.2	2.7
Describes Data Set/Source of Data	2.6	2.7	3.2	2.4	2.7
Explains Variables	2.6	3	2.6	2.6	2.7
Interprets results	NA				
Analyzes in Discussion	3				
AVERAGE TOTAL	2.5	3.2	2.9	2.2	2.7

For the Academic Year 2015/2016, the Graduate Program Committee of Sociology assessed the Program Learning Objective of Inquiry and Analysis (PLO #8). A graduate student cohort was selected for this assessment: once while enrolled in SOC 214 and later while enrolled in SOC 215. For each class (15 students enrolled), five student papers were randomly selected to assess the PLO. Students from SOC214 were given a pre-test; and later in SOC215, a post-test. The test consisted of an in-class writing assignment where students were asked to explain how they would research the effectiveness of a new teaching method in a biology class and also whether the new method affected students' identity as scientists. The rubric used to measure the standard of performance covered 8 central components of inquiry and analysis, including ability to do a comprehensive scholarly literature review, clearly state a research question, relate theory to their research question and/or hypotheses, develop a research design that best addresses their research question, conceptualize/operationalize variables, and analyze findings in relation to the theoretical framework/existing research (see PLO #8 rubrics). Each PLO dimension above was measured with 1-4 scale with scores ranging from low performance (1) to high performance (4).

The reliability of measurement was sought by a panel of four faculty reviewers, who teach for the graduate program. They each scored the random papers in the pre- and post-tests, and their scores were averaged for each category in the matrix of inquiry and analysis (see Appendix II).

Findings:

Because the pre- and post-test was an in-class written assignment, students were not able to cover three of the seven categories that measure inquiry and analysis (i.e., literature review, citations, interpretation of data). These were marked as not applicable (NA). Therefore, in the categories analyzed there was a significant improvement in the overall performance of the students from SOC214 to SOC215: the overall mean score of 2.3 increased to 2.7.

Every category saw an improvement: stating clear hypothesis went from 2 to 2.5, justifying appropriate methods from 2.5 to 2.7, describing data from 2.6 to 2.7, and explaining variables from 2.1 to 2.7.

Conclusion:

There is improvement in student performance in the area of inquiry and analysis, and the great improvement was observed in conceptualizing the variables and the least in elaborating the source of data. This information will be valuable in informing faculty in what areas they can focus on in future classes. The focus in the research methods course is appropriate, because there is evidence that these skills are among the most marketable for graduate students, helping them get into Ph.D. programs or professional employment. Student success in acquiring these skills correlates significantly with success in employment and job satisfaction (Vooren, Nicole Van, and Spalter-Roth, Roberta. 2011. Sociology Master's Graduates Join the Workforce. Research Brief for American Sociological Association, Department of Research Development, July).

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?

This report clearly shows significant improvement within a cohort of graduate students in improving their inquiry and analytical skills (PLO #8). Although the improvement from 2.3 to 2.7 mean score seems modest, the standard of performance across time is significantly improving, which is a very positive sign of change within a year. The program, however, seeks a more substantial improvement in performance among our students, and will work to align graduate courses with explicit, concrete goals in improving inquiry and analytical skills—particularly those categories with low scores—among our students to reach the highest levels possible. I recommend that we revisit these PLO #8 with a similar cohort in the following academic year to assess if our awareness and intentionality of improving our graduate program in this learning objective improves.

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**)

Q5.1.2. 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]**

An important change is that all graduate classes will address and develop among students the various skills of inquiry and analysis: do a comprehensive scholarly literature review, clearly state a research question, relate theory to their research question and/or hypotheses, develop a research design that best addresses their research question, conceptualize/ operationalize variables, and analyze findings in relation to the theoretical framework/existing research (see PLO rubrics).

Courses SOC214 and SOC215 do it more explicitly, but all the other ones (i.e., core and electives) can also integrate readings, develop assignments, and include exercises so students engage consciously and with purpose in developing critical/effective literature reviews, assessing strength of theory and method, conceptualizing/ operationalizing valid measures, and interpreting/analyzing arguments and findings.

More specifically courses SOC200A (Graduate Orientation) and SOC200B (Thesis Prospectus/Project Preparation Seminar) will re-inforce these skills by integrating lectures, discussions, and assignments that address this PLO#8 among others. These courses correspond with SOC214 and SOC215, so they will re-inforce and supplement their learning objectives.

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		X			
13. External accountability reporting requirement		X			
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X

15. Strategic planning		X			
16. Institutional benchmarking			X		
17. Academic policy development or modification		X			
18. Institutional Improvement	X				
19. Resource allocation and budgeting				X	
20. New faculty hiring				X	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff				X	
22. Recruitment of new students		X			

23. Other Specify:

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

We have used the data to improve future assessment tools, and also to take a holistic approach in advancing the PLOs as a graduate program. The standards of performance for each PLO are stated and advanced more explicitly in the graduate program via curriculum maps and course teaching.

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]**

Our graduate program has begun an end-of-the-year Graduate Student Reflection Survey [GSRS] that seeks information to help students advance in the program and also helps the department make improvements. Among the areas examined include: contact information, academic standing, course work completed, thesis stage, committee members, goals/accomplishments (e.g., scholarly/professional activities), and general reflections.

We implemented it this past academic year (2014/2015), but had a small response rate (about 10%). We have assessed and reflected on ways of improving the response rates so that this can become an integral tool for student advising and informing our graduate program's objectives. [see Appendix III]

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

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <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 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 I Program Learning Objectives
 Appendix II Rubrics for Assessing Inquiry & Analysis PLO
 Appendix III End of the Year Graduate Student Reflection Survey

Program Information

<p>P1. Program/Concentration Name(s): MA Sociology</p> <p>P1.1. Report Authors: Manuel Barajas, Aya Ida Kimura, Jacqueline Carrigan, and Todd Migliaccio</p>	<p>P2. Program Director: Manuel Barajas</p> <p>P2.1. Department Chair: Bohsiu Wu</p>				
<p>P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Department of Sociology</p>	<p>P4. College: SSIS</p>				
<p>P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 44</p>	<p>P6. Program Type: [Select only one]</p> <table border="1"> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major</td></tr> <tr><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>2. Credential</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<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:								
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 1 P7.1. List all the name(s): BA in Sociology 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: 1 P8.1. List all the name(s): 1 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 P9.1. List all the names:		Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0 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											
									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		

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

--