2015-2016
Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Report: | MA iMet |

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?** [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 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, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. | |
b. | |
c. | |

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

iMET progInformation Literacy. iMET students will demonstrate the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy.

Students will **(PLO 2: Information Literacy** adopted from the rubric below):

	Capstone	Milestones	
	4	3	2
2.1 Attribution	Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution. • Documents sources consistently and completely • Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently • Cites non-textual sources consistently • Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.	Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation. • Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. • Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies • Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency • Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.	Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings. • Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. • Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in text citation and notes • Does not consistent cite non-textual sourc • Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.
2.2 Evaluation and use of sources	Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought. • Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship • Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources • Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author	Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth. • Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues • Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim •Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author	Source materials used ar inadequate. • Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(• Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources • Does not consistent distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Clearly selected sources out of convenience • Does not identify gaps in the literature contribute to a scholarly conversation

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

○ 4. N/A

○ 5. Other, specify: [   ]

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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip 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?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.
Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Information Literacy

Q2.1.1.
Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

iMet chose to assess the new PLO: Information Literacy and used the Review of Literature in Master action research report (capstone project) as the direct measure to assessment this PLO.

Q2.2.

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

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

Q2.3.
Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Information Literacy is the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy.

Standard: 65% or more above 3 before graduate

	Capstone	Milestones	
	4	3	2
2.1 Attribution	Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution. • Documents sources consistently and completely • Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently • Cites non-textual sources consistently • Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.	Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation. • Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. • Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies • Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency • Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.	Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings. • Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. • Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in text citation and notes • Does not consistent cite non-textual sourc • Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.
2.2 Evaluation and use of sources	Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought. • Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship • Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources • Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author	Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth. • Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues • Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim •Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author	Source materials used ar inadequate. • Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(• Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources • Does not consistent distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Clearly selected sources out of convenience • Does not identify gaps in the literature contribute to a scholarly conversatio

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☑	☑	☑	1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☐	☐	☐	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
☐	☐	☐	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☐	☐	☐	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
☐	☐	☐	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
☐	☐	☐	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
☐	☐	☐	10. Other, specify:

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

1

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

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:

Students in iMet program completed their Master thesis and eportfolio in EDTE 507: Culminating Experience. The Information Literacy rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 6 students review of literature in their action research report from EDTE 507: Culminating Experiences Educational Technology offered in spring 2016. The program advising team is made up of t faculty members. The program coordinator determined the final scores for program assessment purpose. This is the first time that our graduate program has used Information Literacy rubric to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our students' Information Literacy skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students'Information Literacy skill.

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

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

☑ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences

☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program

☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes

☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques

☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects

☐ 6. E-Portfolios

☐ 7. Other Portfolios

☐ 8. Other, specify: [   ]

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

The Review of Literature in Master action research report (capstone project) as the direct measure to assessment this PLO. Please the attachment.

📎 **Key Assessment for the iMET Program.docx**
45.41 KB   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?

○ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

○ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

◉ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 4. Other, specify: [   ] (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

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

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

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

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

One

Q3.5.1.
How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

One

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)?

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

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

All students' action research reports were selected.

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

Since the sample size was small, I decided to use all student samples.

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

6

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

6

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

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)
Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

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

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)

○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

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

☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)

☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)

☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups

☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.
Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

Q3.7.2.
If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.
Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

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

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.
Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

Information Literacy is the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy.

	Capstone	Milestones	Benchmark

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q4.2.
Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

The key assessments analyzed here are students review of literature in thier action research report. Based on the standards and criteria from 2.1 to 2.2 in the Information Literacy rubric , the majority of iMET students had appropriate Information Literacy skills. Students meet the standards of 3.1 (66.6%), 3.2 (66.6%) and 3.5 (66.7%). Students do not meet the standards of 2.1 Attribution (67%) and 2.2 Evauaton and Use of Sources (67%) .

In conclusion, iMET students successfully met criteria 2.1: Attribution (67%), 2.2: Evaluation and Use of Sources (67%). However, there are 33% of the students are in level 1 (benchmark).

	Total % of Students Who score 3.0 or above	Met the Standard or not? (**Standard: 65 %** of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by the time of their graduation.)
Attribution	67%	Met
Evaluation and use of sources	67%	Met

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q4.3.
For the 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/standard has been specified
- ○ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on 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 (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

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.

According to the assessment data, 67% of the studemt met the standards. The program faculty met and discussed the ways to address 33% of the students whp didn't met the standard and key assignments (Review of Literature in Action Research Report).

Q5.1.2.
Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A

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

23. Other, specify: [   ]

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

1) iMET core faculty are in the process of modifying curriculum in iMET program and have used some assessment data from 2015-2016.

2) iMET core faculty are in the process of initiating Alumni advisory board and have used some assessment data from 2015-2016.

3) iMET core faculty have used the assessment data to create conversations about using AACU rubrics in core classes, improving our class room teaching, and developing the program curriculum map.

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

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

[   ]

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q7.
What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 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, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. [   ]

b. [   ]

c. [   ]

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q8.1.
Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Key Assessment for the iMET Program.doc

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.
Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

MA iMet

P1.1.
Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Select...

P2.
Report Author(s):

Chia-Jung Chung

P2.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Dr. Susan M Heredia

P2.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

P3.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Graduate

P4.
College:

College of Education

P5.
Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

25

P6.
Program Type:

○ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major

○ 2. Credential

● 3. Master's Degree

○ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)

○ 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

Don't know

P7.1. List all the names:

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

Don't know

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

Don't know

P8.1. List all the names:

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

Don't know

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

Don't know

P9.1. List all the names:

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

Don't know

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan**...	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	○	○	○	○	◉	○	○
P11.1. last updated?	○	○	○	○	◉	○	○

P11.3.
Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

Graduate Learning Goals_Objectives iMET 2015_16.docx
21.59 KB

P12.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

P12.1.
Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

Graduate Learning Goals_Objectives iMET 2015_16.docx
21.59 KB

P13.
Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

P14.
Does your program have a capstone class?

- ◉ 1. Yes, indicate: EDTE 507
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

P14.1.
Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

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

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

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

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

Format:

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

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

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

Literature Review Template

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

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

In general, the following _Conventions of style_ in research and reporting should be followed:

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

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

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

The general format of your essay should:

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

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

Paper Title (This is your introduction section)

Review of Literature

Level 2 Heading

Level 2 Heading

Level 2 Heading

> **Level 3 heading.**

> **Level 3 heading.**

Level 2 Heading

Major Themes

Discussion

References

Appendixes

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

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy (iMet)
Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

Prepared by Chia-Jung Chung
Coordinator, iMet Program

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives and Program Learning Outcomes Upon graduation from the master's program, iMet graduate students are expected to demonstrate expertise in and a deep understanding of advanced educational technology theories, methods, perspectives, and challenges, including intercultural knowledge and competency. They are expected to apply these knowledge and skills to develop a complex argument, analyze or solve challenging educational problems, lead advanced qualitative and/or quantitative research, and produce high quality data or recommendations for research in educational or relevant corporate setting. They are also expected to communicate the above information effectively through written and oral communication skills. These learning goals and outcomes are aligned well with the missions of the university and the college.

Graduate Learning Objectives	Program Learning Outcomes
1. **Disciplinary knowledge:** Master, integrate, and apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to current, practical, and important contexts and situations.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 1. Demonstrate advanced educational technology knowledge including theories, methods, perspectives, and other content (PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge); 2. Demonstrate a deep understanding of educational technology contributions (PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications); 3. Demonstrate a deep understanding of challenges in educational technology (PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology).
2. **Communication:** Communicate key knowledge with clarity and purpose both within the discipline and in broader contexts.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 4. Communicate effectively in writing about any topics from a sociological perspective (PLO 4: Written communication)

	5. Demonstrate effective oral communication skill (PLO 5: Oral communication)
3. **Critical thinking/analysis:** Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 6. Demonstrate a habit of systematically exploring issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion" (PLO 6: Critical thinking)
4. **Information literacy**: Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad of sources.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 7. Develop the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand (PLO 7: Information literacy)
5. **Professionalism:** Demonstrate an understanding of professional integrity.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 8: Apply knowledge and skills to systematically explore issues or works in many fields through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions, judgments, or recommendations (PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis)
6. **Intercultural/Global Perspectives:** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and application of intercultural and/or global perspectives.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 9. Demonstrate "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" (PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency)

Curriculum Map

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge
PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications
PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology
PLO 4: Written communication
PLO 5: Oral communication
PLO 6: Critical thinking
PLO 7: Information literacy
PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis
PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency

Each program shall create a curriculum map:

1. List all courses, both required and elective, as well as other required graduate education activities.
2. Indicate where in the curriculum each PLO is addressed through development of a curriculum map. The curriculum map may be presented in many formats, including tabular form as the template below. Another format may be substituted
3. *Please indicate if the course is a core (C), an elective (E), or culminating experience (Thesis, Project, or Comprehensive Examination) course.*

Course Work	PLO 1 (K)	PLO 2 (A)	PLO 3 (C)	PLO 4 (W)	PLO 5 (O)	PLO 6 (CT)	PLO 7 (IL)	PLO 8 (IA)	PLO 9 (IC)
EDTE 280 (R)	X	X	X		X				
EDTE 281 (R)	X	X	X		X				
EDTE 251i (R)	X		X			X			X
EDTE 250i (R)	X		X	X		X	X	X	
EDTE 282 (R)	X		X		X				
EDTE 286 (R)	X				X	X		X	X
EDTE283 (R)	X	X	X		X	X		X	
EDTE284 (R)	X	X		X			X		
EDTE285 (R)	X	X			X				
EDTE507 (CE)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	

Assessment Plan

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge (K)
PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications (A)
PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology (C)
PLO 4: Written communication (W)
PLO 5: Oral communication (O)
PLO 6: Critical thinking (CT)
PLO 7: Information literacy (IL)
PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis (IA)
PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency (IC)

Each graduate program shall develop a plan for assessing student achievement of its Program Learning Outcomes:

1. *Indicate the date assessment of the PLO started and identify each PLO separately in the Assessment Plan.*
2. Identify graduate program-specific direct and indirect lines of evidence for each of the PLOs. (See the policy for summaries of the kinds of direct and indirect evaluative data programs might draw on to assess progress towards and achievement of PLOs).
3. *Please indicate the lead personnel associated with evaluating each PLO.*
4. *Articulate evaluation parameters for measuring introductory and advanced levels of graduate student development for each PLO and the timeline for measurement, e.g., at time of admission or prior to culminating experience coursework.*

5. Evaluate each of the PLOs based on direct lines of evidence, collectively supporting the evaluation of introductory and advanced levels of development over the course of each student's program trajectory. Emphasis should be placed on early assessment of indicators that predict success in the graduate experience.

Lines of Evidence for Assessing Graduate Program Learning Outcomes					
Date	PLO	Direct Lines of Evidence (Example: Assignments in core courses; early writing assessment)	Indirect Lines of Evidence (Mid-course assessments; Alumni Survey)	Lead/Resources (Example: Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair)	Evaluation Parameters & Timeline: Examples of timeline: Admission (A); Exit (E); On-going (O); Follow up with Alumni (F); Qualification for Culminating Experience (Q)	Evaluation of each PLO based on direct lines of evidence
	1 (K)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 250 IRB		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	2 (A)	EDTE 283 PD Project EDTE 284 Conference Proposal		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	3 (C)	EDTE 281 Mobile Learning Project		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	4 (W)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	5 (O)	EDTE 280 Online Pedagogy Project Presentation EDTE 283 PD Presentation		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	6 (CT)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	7 (IL)	EDTE 280 Discussion Assignments EDTE 281 Reflection Assignments		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair;	Culminating Experience	

			program website, course SacCT sites		
8 (IA)			Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
9 (IC)	EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	

Action Plan

Based on the assessment data collected, each graduate program shall provide detailed information about action steps to be taken to maintain program quality and/or address identified deficiencies.

1. Assessment Data Summary
2. Evaluation
3. Actions for Program Improvements and/or Continuation

PLO	Assessment Data Summary	Evaluation	Actions for Program Improvement and/or Continuation

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy (iMet)
Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

Prepared by Chia-Jung Chung
Coordinator, iMet Program

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives and Program Learning Outcomes Upon graduation from the master's program, iMet graduate students are expected to demonstrate expertise in and a deep understanding of advanced educational technology theories, methods, perspectives, and challenges, including intercultural knowledge and competency. They are expected to apply these knowledge and skills to develop a complex argument, analyze or solve challenging educational problems, lead advanced qualitative and/or quantitative research, and produce high quality data or recommendations for research in educational or relevant corporate setting. They are also expected to communicate the above information effectively through written and oral communication skills. These learning goals and outcomes are aligned well with the missions of the university and the college.

Graduate Learning Objectives	Program Learning Outcomes
1. **Disciplinary knowledge:** Master, integrate, and apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to current, practical, and important contexts and situations.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 1. Demonstrate advanced educational technology knowledge including theories, methods, perspectives, and other content (PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge); 2. Demonstrate a deep understanding of educational technology contributions (PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications); 3. Demonstrate a deep understanding of challenges in educational technology (PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology).
2. **Communication:** Communicate key knowledge with clarity and purpose both within the discipline and in broader contexts.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 4. Communicate effectively in writing about any topics from a sociological perspective (PLO 4: Written communication)

	5. Demonstrate effective oral communication skill (PLO 5: Oral communication)
3. **Critical thinking/analysis:** Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 6. Demonstrate a habit of systematically exploring issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion" (PLO 6: Critical thinking)
4. **Information literacy**: Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad of sources.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 7. Develop the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand (PLO 7: Information literacy)
5. **Professionalism:** Demonstrate an understanding of professional integrity.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 8: Apply knowledge and skills to systematically explore issues or works in many fields through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions, judgments, or recommendations (PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis)
6. **Intercultural/Global Perspectives:** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and application of intercultural and/or global perspectives.	iMet graduate students are expected to: 9. Demonstrate "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" (PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency)

Curriculum Map

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge
PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications
PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology
PLO 4: Written communication
PLO 5: Oral communication
PLO 6: Critical thinking
PLO 7: Information literacy
PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis
PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency

Each program shall create a curriculum map:

1. List all courses, both required and elective, as well as other required graduate education activities.
2. Indicate where in the curriculum each PLO is addressed through development of a curriculum map. The curriculum map may be presented in many formats, including tabular form as the template below. Another format may be substituted
3. *Please indicate if the course is a core (C), an elective (E), or culminating experience (Thesis, Project, or Comprehensive Examination) course.*

Course Work	PLO 1 (K)	PLO 2 (A)	PLO 3 (C)	PLO 4 (W)	PLO 5 (O)	PLO 6 (CT)	PLO 7 (IL)	PLO 8 (IA)	PLO 9 (IC)
EDTE 280 (R)	X	X	X		X				
EDTE 281 (R)	X	X	X		X				
EDTE 251i (R)	X		X			X			X
EDTE 250i (R)	X		X	X		X	X	X	
EDTE 282 (R)	X		X		X				
EDTE 286 (R)	X				X	X		X	X
EDTE283 (R)	X	X	X		X	X		X	
EDTE284 (R)	X	X		X			X		
EDTE285 (R)	X	X			X				
EDTE507 (CE)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	

Assessment Plan

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge (K)
PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications (A)
PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology (C)
PLO 4: Written communication (W)
PLO 5: Oral communication (O)
PLO 6: Critical thinking (CT)
PLO 7: Information literacy (IL)
PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis (IA)
PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency (IC)

Each graduate program shall develop a plan for assessing student achievement of its Program Learning Outcomes:

1. *Indicate the date assessment of the PLO started and identify each PLO separately in the Assessment Plan.*
2. Identify graduate program-specific direct and indirect lines of evidence for each of the PLOs. (See the policy for summaries of the kinds of direct and indirect evaluative data programs might draw on to assess progress towards and achievement of PLOs).
3. *Please indicate the lead personnel associated with evaluating each PLO.*
4. *Articulate evaluation parameters for measuring introductory and advanced levels of graduate student development for each PLO and the timeline for measurement, e.g., at time of admission or prior to culminating experience coursework.*

5. Evaluate each of the PLOs based on direct lines of evidence, collectively supporting the evaluation of introductory and advanced levels of development over the course of each student's program trajectory. Emphasis should be placed on early assessment of indicators that predict success in the graduate experience.

		Lines of Evidence for Assessing Graduate Program Learning Outcomes				
Date	PLO	Direct Lines of Evidence (Example: Assignments in core courses; early writing assessment)	Indirect Lines of Evidence (Mid-course assessments; Alumni Survey)	Lead/Resources (Example: Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair)	Evaluation Parameters & Timeline: Examples of timeline: Admission (A); Exit (E); On-going (O); Follow up with Alumni (F); Qualification for Culminating Experience (Q)	Evaluation of each PLO based on direct lines of evidence
	1 (K)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 250 IRB		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	2 (A)	EDTE 283 PD Project EDTE 284 Conference Proposal		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	3 (C)	EDTE 281 Mobile Learning Project		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	4 (W)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	5 (O)	EDTE 280 Online Pedagogy Project Presentation EDTE 283 PD Presentation		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	6 (CT)	EDTE 250 Research Proposal EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	7 (IL)	EDTE 280 Discussion Assignments EDTE 281 Reflection Assignments		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair;	Culminating Experience	

				program website, course SacCT sites		
	8 (IA)			Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	
	9 (IC)	EDTE 251 Papers		Faculty Advisors; Course Instructor; Department Chair; program website, course SacCT sites	Culminating Experience	

Action Plan

Based on the assessment data collected, each graduate program shall provide detailed information about action steps to be taken to maintain program quality and/or address identified deficiencies.

1. Assessment Data Summary
2. Evaluation
3. Actions for Program Improvements and/or Continuation

PLO	Assessment Data Summary	Evaluation	Actions for Program Improvement and/or Continuation