



Feedback for the 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report
College of Education
Behavioral Sciences Gender Equity Studies MA

Amy Liu, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Professor of Sociology

Chia-Jung Chung, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Education

Judith Kusnick, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Geology

Elizabeth Strasser, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Anthropology

Fall 2016
California State University, Sacramento



California State University, Sacramento
Office of Academic Program Assessment
6000 J Street • Eureka Hall 203 • Sacramento, CA 95819-3709
(916) 278-2497
<http://www.csus.edu/programassessment>

I. Summary Memo to the Deans/Chairs/Program Directors

To: Dean, College of Education
From: Dr. Amy Liu, Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Date: Fall 2016
Subject: Feedback for the 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report
CC: Office of Academic Affairs

The 2015-2016 annual assessment reports are based on responses to the [2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template](#) prepared by the [Office of Academic Program Assessment](#) (OAPA). The feedback for the *2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report* is summarized below:

| Section: | Details: |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I | Summary Memo to Deans/Chairs/Program Directors |
| II | Detailed Feedback for the 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report |
| III | Commendations and Recommendations |
| IV | Appendices |
| Appendix 1: | WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes ” |
| Appendix 2: | WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes” |
| Appendix 3: | WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes” |
| Appendix 4: | WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews ” |
| Appendix 5: | WSCUC “Rubric for Evaluating General Education Assessment Process” |
| Appendix 6: | Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for the 21st Century & AAC&U’s 16 VALUE Rubrics |
| Appendix 7: | Important Considerations for Program Review and Assessment |
| Appendix 8.1: | The Importance of Action Verbs |
| Appendix 8.2: | Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes |
| Appendix 9: | Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review |
| Appendix 10: | WSCUC Glossary |

We have used appropriate rubrics from WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) for guidance on effective assessment practices in several areas, including the quality of learning outcomes, assessment plans, methods/data/analysis, program review, general education, and the use of assessment data for curricular improvement, academic planning, and budgeting.

We hope all the previous **feedback** reports that you have received from the Office of Academic Program Assessment (2011-2015) in addition to the current one (2015-2016) will be used to help the academic unit (department, program, or college) determine the extent to which its current assessment system is adequate and what additional components or processes may need to be developed or improved for **all the degree programs** in the academic unit.

We would like to thank Dr. Don Taylor, Interim Assistant Vice President, Academic Programs and Educational Effectiveness, Kathy Mine, Administrative Support Coordinator, our assessment consultant team, and our student assistants, Christian and Paul Schoenmann, for their support in this assessment review process. If you have any questions or suggestions, please contact [Dr. Amy Liu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu) (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of OAPA. Thank you.

II. Detailed Feedback for the 2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES GENDER EQUITY STUDIES MA

| Template Questions | Detailed Questions, Criteria, and Comments | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q1: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) | Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2015-2016? | See Report | Inquiry and Analysis. |
| | Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about each PLO you check above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs? | Not Clear | PLOs as written seem to be about Written Communication rather than Inquiry and Analysis. PLO #6 Inquiry and Analysis: Throughout the Gender Equity program students are given assignments to develop their Inquiry and Analysis skills. |
| | Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs? | Yes | (1= Yes for all PLOs) |
| | Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university? | Yes | |
| | Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)? | No | |
| | 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? | N/A | |
| | Q1.5. Did your program use the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)? | No | (2= No but they know the DQP) |
| Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable? | Yes | | |
| Q2: Standards of Performance/Expectation for the Selected PLO | Q2.1. Specify one PLO as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1): | See Report | Inquiry and Analysis |
| | Q2.1.1. Please provide more information about the specific PLO you've chosen in Q2.1 | Not Clear | The information given explains the measure—the Project or Thesis—but not the PLO. |
| | Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO? | Yes | |
| | Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO: | See Report | See VALUE appendix 1 The rubric provided is for Written Communication 65% of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by graduation. |
| | Q2.4. Please indicate where you have published the selected PLO: | See Report | Some syllabi, website, new course proposals |
| | Q2.5. Please indicate where you have published the standard of performance: | See Report | Some syllabi, new course proposals |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Q2.6. Please indicate where you have published the rubric: | See Report | Some syllabi, new course proposals |
| Q3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO | Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO in 2015-2016? | Yes | |
| | Q3.1.1. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? | See Report | 2 |
| | Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO in 2015-2016? | Yes | |
| | Q3.2.1. 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 Report | Randomly selected from three core courses: EDUC 165, EDTE 251, EDTE 266 |
| Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, | Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? | Not Clear | Program reports that No direct measures were used , BUT essays were collected in three courses? |
| | Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? | Missing | |
| | Q3.3.2. Please explain and attach the direct measure you used to collect data. | | |
| | Q3.4. What tool was used to evaluate the data? | | |
| | Q3.4.1. If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? | | |
| | Q3.4.2. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? | | |
| | Q3.4.3. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? | | |
| | Q3.4.4. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignments, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? | | |
| | Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? | | |
| | Q3.5.1. How many faculty members participated in the evaluation of the assessment data for the selected PLO? | | |
| | Q3.5.2. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? | | |
| | Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? | | |
| | Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review? | | |
| | Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? | | From Q3.2.1 – 12 essays |
| | Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? | | |
| Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.) | Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? | No | |
| | Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? | N/A | |
| | Q3.7.1.1. Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data: | N/A | |
| | Q3.7.2. If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided? | N/A | |
| | Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample. | N/A | |
| | Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate? | N/A | |
| 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? | No | |
| | Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? | N/A | |
| | Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? | No | |
| | Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify: | N/A | |
| Q4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions | Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: | Missing | No data is provided. From Q3.2.1: <i>Of the 12 writing assignments reviewed, 10 were scored at capstone 4 level, one essay was scored at 3, and one essay was scored 2. The lower scored essay was a newly admitted MA student. The higher scored essays were both second year MA students.</i> |
| | Q4.1a. Does the program explicitly assess the PLO? | Not Clear | The stated PLO–Inquiry and Analysis–is not measured effectively using a Written Communication rubric. The data are not fully reported. |
| | 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? | Missing | This answer largely describes what the <u>faculty</u> and <u>program</u> do, not what students are able to do. |
| | Q4.2a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion? | Not Clear | |
| | Q4.3. Do students partially meet, meet, or exceed the program’s standard of performance (Q2.2) based on their assessment data ? | Don’t Know | (6= Don’t Know) |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Q4.3a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome? | Not Clear | No data is provided. |
| Q4A: Alignment and Quality | Q4.4. <i>Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?</i> | No | Program previously claimed no measures were used. As noted elsewhere, the PLO and measures do not align. |
| | Q4.5. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? | No | |
| Q5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop) | Q5.1. <i>As a result of the assessment effort in 2015-2016 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)?</i> | Yes | |
| | 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 | See Report | More examples to be collected next time |
| | Q5.1.2. <i>Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?</i> | Yes | |
| | Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2014 - 2015) been used so far? | See Report | |
| | Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above. | See Report | Revise and strengthen course curriculum, sequence of delivery, and recruitment efforts |
| 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 | N/A | |
| | Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? | See Report | Oral Com |
| | Q8. Have you attached any appendices? | Yes | VALUE with standard |
| Summary | S1. Does the program follow the template by answering where applicable? | Partially | Used an older Word template, please use the latest template. See our website. |
| | S2. Were the program's answers simple and clear? | Partially | Information provided in unexpected places, some questions were not answered. |
| | S3. Does the program assess the PLO using correct alignment of standard, rubric, and measure (Q2.3, Q4.1a)? | No | Mismatch between PLO and rubric |
| | S4. Overall, <i>do students partially meet, meet, or exceed program's standard of performance based on consultant's review?</i> | Don't Know | We don't know whether students are meeting the program standard or not. See feedback and comments above. |

II. Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations:

The program is commended for addressing the following areas well:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:

- Specified three PLOs based on desired knowledge, dispositions and skills.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- Identified key assignments in three courses to evaluate.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:

- Set a standard of performance at graduation that expresses the percentage of students performing at a desired level of performance (65% of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by graduation.)

Data Collection and Presentation:

- Used direct measures of student learning.

Use of Assessment Data:

- Plan to use assessment data to better track student progress in writing.
- Used previous assessment data to improve student learning through revisions in courses and curriculum, and new faculty hiring.

Recommendations:

As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to **answer each question as asked** and pay attention to the following areas:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:

- PLOs should be framed as what students should know and be able to do. The PLO as stated in Q1.2 states the PLO as the assignments that students will do. Later in the report, the three PLOs from the program are presented but there is no correlation provided between these PLOs and sub PLOs and Inquiry and Analysis. Given the confusion we had about whether the program was assessing Inquiry and Analysis or Written Communication (see below), if the program finds it important to measure Inquiry and Analysis, it would be useful to define what Inquiry and Analysis explicitly means in this discipline. It could be very helpful to review the VALUE Inquiry and Analysis rubric as a departure point for defining the elements of Inquiry and Analysis.
- We recommend the program revisit their three PLOs as provided in the answer to Q4. While these PLOs are currently very relevant to the program, they could be restated to be more measurable. For example, the verb “understands” is very difficult to measure. It would be more useful to state what students can do when they understand, for example, different models of curriculum design. Can they design curriculum using different designs? Evaluate the curriculum from the perspective of different models? Either of these would be more amenable to measurement. See the end of this report for a list of action verbs that will be more measurable than the current verbs used in all three PLOs.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- The report states that PLO #6 (Inquiry and Analysis) is being assessed. Yet the description of the PLO points to the Written Communication VALUE rubric rather than the Inquiry and Analysis rubric.

Data Collection and Presentation:

- For purposes of program improvement, it would be more useful to break out data by each criterion of the rubric (three criteria were listed in Q1.2). For example, it would be useful to know, for the lower scoring students, which criteria did the students perform poorly in?

Summary:

- Use your curriculum map to help students develop their roadmaps (academic plan) for the degree, so that their roadmap to the degree is explicitly linked to student learning (annual program assessment and 6-year program review), PLOs (program learning outcomes), advising, and the mission of the program and the university.

Appendix 1: WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”

<http://www.wascsenior.org/search/site/Rubrics%20combined>

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.Comprehensive List | The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, and disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems). | The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear. | The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered. | The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students’ level of mastery of each outcome. |
| 2.Assessable Outcomes | Outcomes statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. “Statements understand scientific method” do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed. | Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning. | Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., “Graduates can write reports in APA style” or “Graduate can make original contributions to biological knowledge.” | Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty has agreed on explicit criteria statements such as rubrics, and have identified example of student performance at varying levels of each outcome. |
| 3.Alignment | There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience. | Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum. | The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map. | Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency. |
| 4.Assessment Planning | There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome. | The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in current year. | The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements. | The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed. |
| 5.The Student Experience | Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent. | Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors. | Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere. | Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcome levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents. |

Appendix 2: WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Relevant Outcomes and Lines of Evidence Identified | It is not clear which program outcomes will be assessed in the capstone course. | The relevant outcomes are identified, e.g., ability to integrate knowledge to solve complex problems; however, concrete plans for collecting evidence for each outcome have not been developed. | Relevant outcomes are identified. Concrete plans for collecting evidence for each outcome are agreed upon and used routinely by faculty who staff the capstone course. | Relevant evidence is collected; faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, e.g., rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels of mastery for each relevant outcome. |
| 2. Valid Results | It is not clear that potentially valid evidence for each relevant outcome is collected and/or individual faculty use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work or performances. | Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for each outcome; they have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome but these are not yet fully defined. | Faculty have agreed on concrete plans for collecting relevant evidence for each outcome. Explicit criteria, e.g., rubrics, have been developed to assess the level of student attainment of each outcome. | Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; they usually are shared with students. Feedback from external reviewers has led to refinements in the assessment process, and the department uses external benchmarking data. |
| 3. Reliable Results | Those who review student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way; there are no checks for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated, and faculty routinely find assessment data have high inter-rater reliability. |
| 4. Results Are Used | Results for each outcome may or may not be collected. They are not discussed among faculty. | Results for each outcome are collected and may be discussed by the faculty, but results have not been used to improve the program. | Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by faculty, analyzed, and used to improve the program. | Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve results. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning. |
| 5. The Student Experience | Students know little or nothing about the purpose of the capstone or outcomes to be assessed. It is just another course or requirement. | Students have some knowledge of the purpose and outcomes of the capstone. Communication is occasional, informal, left to individual faculty or advisors. | Students have a good grasp of purpose and outcomes of the capstone and embrace it as a learning opportunity. Information is readily available in advising guides, etc. | Students are well-acquainted with purpose and outcomes of the capstone and embrace it. They may participate in refining the experience, outcomes, and rubrics. Information is readily available. |

Appendix 3: WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Clarification of Students' Task | Instructions to students for portfolio development provide insufficient detail for them to know what faculty expect. Instructions may not identify outcomes to be addressed in the portfolio. | Students receive some written instructions for their portfolios, but they still have problems determining what is required of them and/or why they are compiling a portfolio. | Students receive written instructions that describe faculty expectations in detail and include the purpose of the portfolio, types of evidence to include, role of the reflective essay (if required), and format of the finished product. | Students in the program understand the portfolio requirement and the rationale for it, and they view the portfolio as helping them develop self-assessment skills. Faculty may monitor the developing portfolio to provide formative feedback and/or advise individual students. |
| 2. Valid Results | It is not clear that valid evidence for each relevant outcome is collected and/or individual reviewers use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work. | Appropriate evidence is collected for each outcome, and faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome. | Appropriate evidence is collected for each outcome; faculty use explicit criteria, such as agreed-upon rubrics, to assess student attainment of each outcome. Rubrics are usually shared with students. | Assessment criteria, e.g., in the form of rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; they are shared with students, and student may have helped develop them. Feedback from external reviewers has led to refinements in the assessment process. The department also uses external benchmarking data. |
| 3. Reliable Results | Those who review student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and there are no checks for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. | Reviewers are calibrated; faculty routinely find that assessment data have high inter-rater reliability. |
| 4. Results Are Used | Results for each outcome are collected, but they are not discussed among the faculty. | Results for each outcome are collected and discussed by the faculty, but results have not been used to improve the program. | Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by faculty, and used to improve the program. | Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve student learning. Students may also participate in discussions and/or receive feedback, either individual or in the aggregate. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning. |
| 5. If e-Portfolios Are Used | There is no technical support for students or faculty to learn the software or to deal with problems. | There is informal or minimal formal support for students and faculty. | Formal technical support is readily available and proactively assists in learning the software and solving problems. | Support is readily available, proactive, and effective. Tech support personnel may also participate in refining the overall portfolio process. |

Appendix 4: WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Required Elements of the Self-Study | Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes. | Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings. | Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. | Faculty are required to evaluate the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, bench-marking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. |
| 2. Process of Review | Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades. | Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation. | Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts; departments use the feedback to improve their work. | Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning. |
| 3. Planning and Budgeting | The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes. | The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success. | The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process. | The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments. |
| 4. Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts | No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc. | An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. | A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work. | A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support |
| 5. The Student Experience | Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review. | Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys | The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it. | Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback. |

Appendix 5: WSCUC “Rubric for Evaluating General Education Assessment Process”

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. GE Outcomes | GE learning outcomes have not yet been developed for the entire GE program; there may be one or two common ones, e.g., writing, critical thinking. | Learning outcomes have been developed for the entire GE program, but list is problematic (e.g. too long, too short, unconnected to mission and values). Outcomes do not lend themselves to demonstrations of student learning. | The list of outcomes is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the most important knowledge, skills, and values of the GE program. Outcomes express learning can be demonstrated. Work to define levels of performance is beginning. | The list of outcomes is reasonable and appropriate. Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing students' mastery and have identified exemplars of student performance at varying levels for each outcome. |
| 2. Curriculum Alignment with Outcomes | There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the GE curriculum. Students may not have opportunity to develop each outcome adequately. | Students appear to have reasonable opportunities to develop each of the GE outcomes. Curriculum map may indicate opportunities to acquire outcomes. Sequencing and frequency of opportunities may be problematic | The curriculum is explicitly designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. Design may be summarized in a curriculum map that shows “beginning,” “intermediate” and “advanced” treatment of outcomes. | GE curriculum, pedagogy, grading, advising, etc. explicitly aligned with GE outcomes. Curriculum map and rubrics in use well known and consistently used. Co-curriculum and relevant student support services are also viewed as resources for GE learning and aligned with GE outcomes. |
| 3. Assessment Planning | There is no formal plan for assessing each GE outcome. There is no coordinator or committee that takes responsibility for the program or implementation of its assessment plan. | GE assessment relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year. Interpretation and use of findings for improvement are implicit rather than planned or funded. There is no individual or committee “in charge.” | The campus has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each GE outcome will be assessed. The plan includes specific mechanisms for interpretation and use of findings for improvement. A coordinator or committee is charged to oversee the program and its assessment. | The campus has a fully articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed. A coordinator or committee leads review and revision of the plan, as needed, based on experience and feedback from internal & external reviewers. The campus uses some form of comparative data (e.g., own past record, aspiration goals, external benchmarking). |
| 4. Assessment Implementation | It is not clear that potentially valid evidence for each GE outcome is collected and/or individual reviewers use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work. | Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome. Reviewers of student work are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and/ or faculty check for inter-rater reliability. | Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, to assess student attainment of each outcome. Reviewers of student work are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. | Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined over time; and they usually are shared with students. Reviewers of student work are calibrated, and faculty routinely find high inter-rater reliability. Faculty take comparative data into account when interpreting results and deciding on changes to improve learning. |
| 5. Use of Results | Results for GE outcomes are collected, but relevant faculty do not discuss them. There is little or no collective use of findings. Students are unaware of, uninvolved in the process. | Results for each GE outcome are collected and discussed by relevant faculty; results have been used occasionally to improve the GE program. Students are vaguely aware of outcomes and assessments to improve their learning. | Results for each outcome are collected, discussed by relevant faculty and others, and regularly used to improve the GE program. Students are very aware of and engaged in improvement of their GE learning. | Relevant faculty routinely discuss results, plan improvements, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians, student affairs professionals, students, to improve the program. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning. |

Appendix 6: Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for The 21st Century & AAC&U's 16 VALUE Rubrics

<http://www.csus.edu/wascaccreditation/Documents/Endnotes/E044.pdf>

1. **Competence in the Disciplines:** The ability to demonstrate the competencies and values listed below in *at least one major field of study* and to demonstrate informed understandings of other fields, drawing on the knowledge and skills of disciplines outside the major.
2. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World** through study in the *sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts*. Focused by engagement with big questions, contemporary and enduring.
3. **Intellectual and Practical Skills, including:** *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving*, practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance.
 - 3.1 [Critical thinking](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.2 [Information literacy](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.3 [Written communication](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.4 [Oral communication](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.5 [Quantitative literacy](#) (WSCUC core competency)
 - 3.6 [Inquiry and analysis](#) (Sixth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.7 [Creative thinking](#) (Seventh VALUE rubric)
 - 3.8 [Reading](#) (Eighth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.9 [Teamwork](#) (Ninth VALUE rubric)
 - 3.10 [Problem solving](#) (Tenth VALUE rubric)
4. **Personal and Social Responsibility (Values), including:** *civic knowledge and engagement—local and global, intercultural knowledge and competence**, *ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning* anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.
 - 4.1 [Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global](#) (Eleventh VALUE rubric)
 - 4.2 [Intercultural knowledge and competence](#) (Twelfth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.3 [Ethical reasoning](#) (Thirteenth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.4 [Foundations and skills for lifelong learning](#) (Fourteenth VALUE rubric)
 - 4.5 [Global Learning](#) (Fifteenth VALUE rubric)
5. **Integrative Learning ****, including: *synthesis and advanced accomplishment* across general and specialized studies.
 - a. [Integrative and applied learning](#) (Sixteen VALUE rubric)


All of the above are demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities (values) to new settings and complex problems.

**Understanding of and respect for those who are different from oneself and the ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.*

*** Interdisciplinary learning, learning communities, capstone or senior studies in the General Education program and/or in the major connecting learning goals with the content and practices of the educational programs including GE, departmental majors, the co-curriculum and assessments.*

Appendix 7: Important Considerations for Programs Review & Assessment

(Update on 11/8/2016)



In the future, please keep the following questions in mind when the unit (program, department, or the college) reflects on assessing student learning outcomes and improving the programs:

P1 (Q1) Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

1.1. PLO List: What are your program learning outcomes (PLOs): **what should your students know, value, and be able to do (at the time of graduation)?**

1.2. Assessable Outcomes: Is each program learning outcome assessable? What **action verbs** are used?

1.3. Alignment:

1.3.1. Is each program learning outcome aligned closely with the curriculum, the key assignment, the rubric, pedagogy, grading, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?

1.3.2. Are the PLOs aligned closely with the mission of the university and the department/college?

1.4. Assessment Plan: Has an assessment plan for each program (department or college) been developed or updated? Have curriculum maps been developed? Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed and used? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time such as within a six-year program review cycle? Is the plan sustainable in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Is the assessment plan revised as needed?

1.5. Student Experience: Are the PLOs widely shared? Are students aware of these learning outcomes? Do they often use them to assess the learning outcomes themselves? Where are the program learning outcomes published for view, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs?

P2 (Q2) Standards of Performance (Expectations)/Rubrics:

- 2.1** What are the explicit **PROGRAM** (not course) **standards of performance** for each outcome? What are the **expectations** for each outcome? Have the programs achieved the learning outcomes: **the standards** and/or **the expectations**?
- 2.2.** Are **rubrics** needed to assess the PLOs? If **yes**, what rubrics are used to assess a particular PLO?
- 2.3.** Are these PLOs (together with their standards of performance and achievement targets) able to demonstrate the **meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness** of the degree program?

P3 (Q3) Measures Used:

- 3.1** What direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) are used to collect the data?
- 3.2** What indirect measures (national, university conducted, college/department/program, alumni, employer, and advisory board student surveys or focus groups or interviews, etc.) are used to collect the data?
- 3.3** Are external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?
- 3.4** Which other measures (national disciplinary, state/professional licensure exams, general knowledge and skills measures, other standardized knowledge and skill exams, etc.) are used?

P4 (Q4) Data and Findings:

- 4.1** What are the **data, analyses, and findings for EACH program learning outcome**?
- 4.2** What is the **quality of the data: how reliable and valid is the data**? Other than GPA, what data/evidences are used to determine whether your graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (BA/BS or MA/MS)? If two or more pieces of assessment data are used for each outcome, is the data consistent or contradictory?
- 4.3** Are the data, analyses, and findings clearly presented (in tables) so that they are easy for other faculty and the **general public** to understand and/or use?

P5 (Q5) Use of Data:

- 5.1** **Who is going to use the data**? Is the data used only for the course or for the program where the data is collected, or do you want the data to be used broadly for the curriculum, budgeting, or strategic planning at the department, the college, or the university level?
- 5.2** **Follow-Up Assessment:** Has the program conducted **follow-up assessment** to evaluate the effectiveness of program changes made based on assessment data? **If yes, how effective are those changes**?

Appendix 8.1: The Importance of Action Verbs

| The Importance of Action Verbs (Mager, 1975, cited in Brown, 1995) | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Multiple Interpretations | Fewer Interpretations |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ to know➤ to understand➤ to really understand➤ to appreciate➤ to fully appreciate➤ to grasp the significance of➤ to enjoy➤ to believe➤ to have faith in | <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ to write➤ to recite➤ to identify➤ to sort➤ to solve➤ to construct➤ to build➤ to compare➤ to contrast |

Appendix 8.2: 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 | |

Page 37: Adapted from Gronlund (1991).

Allen, Mary. 2004. "Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education". San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing, Part of Jossey-Bass.

Appendix 9: Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review

Ideally, academic program assessment and review at Sacramento State should be an ongoing process that facilitates continuous program improvement and includes the following areas¹:

Assessment Plan: Each program needs to develop a program assessment plan which contains the following elements: Program goals and learning outcomes, methods for assessing progress toward these outcomes, and a timetable. This plan should be updated annually or frequently.

Annual Program Assessment Report: Program learning outcomes (PLOs) should be directly aligned with course learning outcomes (CLOs) and the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals (UBLGs). Programs are asked to provide the Office of Academic Affairs with an annual report (annual assessment report -AAR) on program assessment activities that occurred during the past academic year. These reports should identify learning goals and outcomes that were targeted for program assessment, measures used to evaluate progress toward those outcomes, data and analysis, and changes made or planned in response to the results. Annual program assessment and the assessment reports provide a solid foundation and data for the six year program review at Sacramento State.

Program Review: Each department undertakes an extensive program review every six years. As part of the program review process, departments are asked to use annual program assessment data to evaluate how well students are meeting program learning outcomes and university learning goals.

Thus, each department in our university should have in place a system for collecting and using evidence to improve student learning. So far, not all departments have established program learning outcomes and/or approaches to assess learning for all degree programs; it is essential to make these expectations explicit. This will help departments and colleges to assure that every degree program has or will have in place a quality assurance system for assessing and tracking student learning, and use this information to improve their respective programs. Importantly, departments should also present learning expectations, data, findings, and analysis in a way that is easy to understand and/or to use by the faculty, students, administration, the general public, accreditation agencies, and policy-makers.

¹ Adapted from the information at <http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/>

Appendix 10: WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) GLOSSARY

<https://www.wascsenior.org/content/wasc-glossary>

A glossary of terms used in this report and by WSCUC accreditation is provided below. As WSCUC points in its most updated Handbook of Accreditation:

“Many of these terms have multiple meanings and/or have been used in different ways by different associations, institutions, and individuals. The definitions that follow represent the way WSCUC typically uses these words for purposes of institutional review and reporting. If local usage differs significantly from the definitions below, the institutions should consider translating its terms for accreditation purposes to avoid misunderstanding on the part of the evaluation term, WSCUC staff, and others” (WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation 2012:39).”

To avoid misunderstanding by WSCUC and confusion at Sacramento State, Office of Academic Program Assessment has decided to use the same definitions from the WSCUC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation Glossary (linked above.)

AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and University) - Washington-based national organization dedicated to promotion of liberal learning and its integration with professional and civic education.

Accountability - in higher education, being answerable to the public, e.g., students, parents, policymakers, employers. Historically, accountability has focused on financial resources; emphasis now extends to students' academic progress, including retention, acquisition of knowledge and skills, and degree completion.

Alignment - connections among functions or dimensions of an institution that support achievement of goals, e.g., among curriculum, pedagogy, and expected outcomes; or priorities, planning, and resource allocation.

Assessment (of student learning) - an ongoing, iterative process consisting of four basic steps: 1. defining learning outcomes; 2. choosing a method or approach and then using it to gather evidence of learning; 3. analyzing and interpreting the evidence; and 4. using this information to improve student learning.

Benchmark - a point of reference or standard of excellence in relation to which something can be compared and judged. A specific level of student performance may serve as the benchmark that students are expected to meet at a particular point in time or developmental level. Retention and graduation rates may also be benchmarked against those of peer institutions or national norms.

Capstone – a culminating project or experience, usually associated with undergraduates but also applicable to graduate education, that generally takes place in the student's final year of study and requires review, synthesis, and application of what has been learned over the course of the student's college experience. The result may be a product (e.g., original research, an innovative engineering design, an art exhibit) or a performance (e.g., a recital, an internship, student teaching). The capstone can provide evidence for assessment of a range of outcomes, e.g., core competencies, general education outcomes, and institution-level outcomes, as well as those for the major or graduate degree.

Closing the Loop - refers to the four-step assessment cycle (see “assessment of student learning”) and the need to complete the cycle in order to improve learning. “Completing the cycle” may be understood as 1. completing step 4; or 2. completing step 4 and then repeating the cycle to see whether the changes implemented have produced the desired result.

Co-curricular Learning - learning that takes place in activities and programs that are not part of the prescribed sequence of courses in an academic program.

Criterion-Referenced - testing or assessment in which student performance is judged in relation to pre-established standards and not in relation to the performance of other students.

Culture of Evidence – a habit of using evidence in assessment, decision making, planning, resource allocation, and other institutional processes that is embedded in and characteristic of an institution’s actions and practices.

Curriculum Map - a visual representation, usually in the form of a table or matrix, which shows the alignment of course outcomes with program learning outcomes. Well-crafted curriculum maps also show development of proficiency levels, for example using terminology such as “beginning,” “intermediate,” and “advanced” or “introduced,” “developed,” and “mastered.”

Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master’s degree.

Direct Method - in assessment of student learning, a way of gathering evidence of learning directly, e.g., through scoring of actual student work or performances, rather than indirectly, e.g., through self-reports, surveys, etc. Direct evidence can be supplemented by indirect evidence and descriptive data.

External Validation - corroboration or confirmation through an outside source. External validation has two dimensions: 1. data from external sources may be used to confirm that something has been accurately judged and documented; and 2. external reviewers may be invited to examine the evidence. External validation can bring fresh perspectives and lend credibility. See also “external evaluator.”

Formative Assessment - assessment intended to provide feedback and support for improved performance as part of an ongoing learning process, whether at the student, program, or institution level. See also “summative assessment.”

Goal - 1. In assessment of student learning, a high-level, very general statement of learning expected of graduates, aligned with the institution’s mission, vision, and values (more specific learning outcomes are derived from goals); 2. A statement developed by an institution or program related to strategic planning, financial development, and other important issues.

High-Impact Practice (HIP): HIPs include first year seminars, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, service learning, internships, and capstone courses or projects. Research suggests that if students experience one or more HIPS in the course of their studies, they are more likely to persist, achieve higher levels of learning, and complete their degrees.

Indirect Method - in assessment of student learning, a way to capture evidence of learning in the form of opinions—for example, of students, employers, and alumni—by means of surveys, focus groups, exit interviews, etc. Indirect evidence is mediated by personal perceptions and experiences, and learning can only be inferred. Indirect evidence may be supplemented by descriptive data.

Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) – a project of AAC&U, the LEAP outcomes (also known as Essential Learning Outcomes) total 12, grouped under the headings “Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural and Physical World,” “Intellectual and Practical Skills,” “Personal and Social Responsibility,” and “Integrative and Applied Learning.”

Mission - in higher education, an institution’s formally adopted statement of its fundamental reasons for existence, its shared purposes and values, and the students that it aims to serve. The mission is central to decisions about priorities and strategic objectives and provides a context for WSCUC decisions about quality and accreditation.

Norming - 1. In assessment of student learning, a process of training raters to evaluate student products and performances consistently, typically using criterion-referenced standards and rubrics; 2. In accreditation, can be applied to other reviewing and rating processes, e.g. institutional evaluation, Commission actions.

Norm-Referenced - testing or assessment in which student performance is judged in relation to the performance of a larger group of students, not measured against a pre-established standard.

OAPA - Office of Academic Program Assessment at Sacramento State located in Library 67.

Objective - in assessment of student learning, a concise statement of what the instructor (or program or institution) intends a student to learn (on some campuses, objectives then lead to development of learning outcomes); 2. Sometimes used interchangeably with “outcome,” but “outcome” has become the more common usage because of its more direct focus on the result (or “outcome”) for the student; 3. In institution- or program-level planning, more specific statements derived from general goals; 4. in psychometrics, a test consisting of factual questions requiring short answers that can be reliably scored using an answer key, minimizing subjective judgments.

Outcome - in assessment of student learning, a concise statement of what the student should know or be able to do. Well-articulated learning outcomes describe how a student can demonstrate the desired outcome; verbs such as “understand” or “appreciate” are avoided in favor of observable actions, e.g., “identify,” “analyze.” Learning outcomes can be formulated for different levels of aggregation and analysis. Student learning outcomes are commonly abbreviated as SLOs, course learning outcomes as CLOs, program learning outcomes as PLOs, and institution-level outcomes as ILOs. 2. Other outcomes may address access, retention and graduation, and other indicators aligned with institutional mission and goals.

Persistence - like “retention,” refers to the rate at which students return to college from semester to semester and year to year, or “persist” in their education. Some educators interpret “retention” as putting the responsibility for degree completion on the institution, whereas “persistence” puts the responsibility on the student.

Planning (Assessment) - the development of a design by which an institution sets goals and objectives and identifies the means to measure their accomplishment. *Institutional* planning may address educational programs, support services, the physical plant, budgets and finances, and other aspects of institutional operation and future development.

Portfolio - In assessment of student learning, a method of collecting student work so that the evidence can be reviewed in relation to specific learning outcomes. Most student portfolios also include a reflection on the learning process. Portfolios are highly adaptable: they may be developmental (showing progress from rough draft to finished product) or cumulative (i.e., students’ “best work”); and they may be assembled at the level of the individual student, program, or institution.

Program - 1. A systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses that forms a considerable part, or all, of the requirements for a degree in a major or professional field; 2. sometimes refers to the total educational offering of an institution.

Program Review - a systematic process of examining the capacity, processes, and outcomes of a degree program or department in order to judge its quality and effectiveness and to support improvement. Historically, program review focused primarily on capacity and research output; more recently, educational outcomes and student success have been included. While student success and assessment of learning at the program level are an important part of program review, they should not be confused with the more encompassing process of program review.

Reliability - in psychometrics and assessment of student learning, the consistency and dependability of judgments and measurements. See also “validity.”

Retention - typically refers to the rate at which students return and re-enroll in college from semester to semester and year to year; retention rates from first to second year are of particular interest, since that is when the heaviest attrition is likely to occur.

Rigor - in education, refers both to a challenging curriculum and to the consistency or stringency with which high standards for student learning and performance are upheld.

Rubric – a tool for scoring student work or performances, typically in the form of a table or matrix, with criteria that describe the dimensions of the outcome down the left-hand vertical axis, and levels of performance across the horizontal axis. The work or performance may be given an overall score (holistic scoring), or criteria may be scored individually (analytic scoring). Rubrics are also used to communicate expectations to students. 2. WSCUC has developed a number of rubrics to assist teams and institutions in evaluating various aspects of their curriculum and assessment processes.

Signature Assignment - an embedded assessment method using an assignment—either the identical assignment or multiple assignments all constructed according to a common template— across multiple courses or sections of courses. A sample of students’ work products is then examined using a rubric to arrive at judgments about the quality of student learning across the course, program, or institution. Alternatively, a signature question may be embedded, for example, in final exams.

Standard - broadly refers to statements of expectations for student learning, which may include content standards, performance standards, and benchmarks. In the K-12 arena, standards generally describe content, but not level of mastery. In higher education, in contrast, standards generally refer to expected levels of mastery or proficiency. Not to be confused with standards of accreditation.

Standard of Performance - the degree of skill or proficiency with which a student demonstrates a learning outcome. WSCUC Standard 2, CFR 2.2a, requires institutions to report on their students’ levels of performance at or near the time of graduation in five core competencies: writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy. Standards of performance are set by faculty and other educators on campus.

Standardized - a good practice meaning that a protocol or set of guidelines is consistently followed. For example, individuals may be trained in using scoring rubrics or conducting focus groups such that their activities are “standardized” to support the collection of reliable data. Commercially available tests are often referred to as “standardized tests,” and “standardized” has acquired negative connotations in some circles.

Standards of Accreditation - standards of accreditation are the principles used as a basis for judgment in accreditation reviews. WSCUC has four Standards that flow from three Core Commitments. They are used to guide institutions in assessing institutional performance, to identify areas needing improvement, and to serve as the basis for judgment of the institution by evaluation teams and the Senior College Commission

Student Success – a phrase often used as shorthand for retention and degree completion. For WSCUC, student success includes quality of learning and rigor as well as retention and completion.

Student-Centeredness - 1) a shift in perspective from teaching and inputs (e.g., assignments) to desired outcomes and what students actually learn; 2) an approach that places the student (the learner) at the center of the educational process by providing more curricular flexibility, more accessible services, a supportive campus climate, and so on.

Summative Assessment - 1. assessment that occurs at the conclusion or end point of a course, program, or college experience to determine whether student learning outcomes have been achieved; 2. applied organizationally, the use of certain methods to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a program, an institution, or some element of the course of study. See also “formative assessment.”

Sustainability - ability of an educational institution to maintain effective functioning and improve over the long term. Assumes financial viability, but also availability of human capital and other resources, as well as vision, planning, and flexibility.

Triangulation - the use of multiple methods to generate more robust evidence and to see whether results converge or diverge.

Validity - in psychometrics and assessment of student learning, refers to how well a particular assessment method actually measures what it is intended to measure. Considerations include construct validity, content validity, and face validity. May also refer to consequences, i.e., whether an assessment has “consequential validity” and will support subsequent actions to improve learning. See also “reliability.”

VALUE rubrics - Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education; a set of fifteen rubrics developed by AAC&U in collaboration with hundreds of faculty to assess learning outcomes defined by the LEAP project. Institutions may download the rubrics at no cost and are encouraged to modify them to suit local needs.

Value-added - 1. in higher education, the contribution that institutions make to their students’ learning and development, documented from students’ entry to exit; 2. a WSCUC value, namely to promote an accreditation process that adds value to institutions and helps them to achieve their own goals.

WASC - See WSCUC.

WSCUC (formerly WASC) - “Western Association of Schools and Colleges” The three Commissions under the WSCUC umbrella: [1] the Accrediting Commission for Schools (ACS); [2] the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC); and [3] the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU), also referred to as the Senior College Commission.

In the context of the 2013 Handbook, WSCUC refers to the Senior College Commission.