



**Feedback for the 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
*2nd BS Speech Pathology & Audiology***

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

**Jacqueline Brooks, Ph.D.
OAPA Consultant and Assistant Professor of Sociology**

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

**Judith Kusnick, Ph.D.
OAPA Consultant and Professor of Geology**

**Jing Pang, Ph.D.
OAPA Consultant and Professor of Electrical & Electronic Engineering**

**Fall 2017
California State University, Sacramento**



California State University, Sacramento
Office of Academic Program Assessment
6000 J Street • Library 67 • Sacramento, CA 95819
(916) 278-2497
<http://www.csus.edu/programassessment>

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

To: Chair, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
From: Dr. Amy Liu, Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Date: Fall 2017
Subject: Feedback for the 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report
CC: Office of Academic Affairs

The 2016-2017 Annual Assessment reports are based on responses to the [2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template](#) prepared by the [Office of Academic Program Assessment](#) (OAPA). The feedback for the 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report is summarized below:

Section:	Details:
I	Summary Memo to Deans/Chairs/Program Directors
II	Commendations and Recommendations
III	Detailed Feedback
Appendix 1:	Guidelines for Completing the Assessment Report Template
Appendix 2:	Principles for Program Assessment and Review
Appendix 3:	WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes ”
Appendix 4:	WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”
Appendix 5:	WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”
Appendix 6:	WSCUC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews ”
Appendix 7:	WSCUC “Rubric for Evaluating General Education Assessment Process”
Appendix 8:	Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for the 21st Century & AAC&U’s 16 VALUE Rubrics
Appendix 9:	Sacramento State Graduate Learning Goals Policy
Appendix 10:	The Importance of Action Verbs
Appendix 11	Relevant Verbs in Defining Learning Outcomes
Appendix 12A:	Example: The VALUE Rubric for the Critical Thinking Skill
Appendix 12B.1:	Example: Data Collection Sheet for the Critical Thinking Skill
Appendix 12B.2:	Example: Raw Data Summary for the Critical Thinking Skill for the Program
Appendix 12B.3:	Example: Data Summary for the Critical Thinking Skill for the Program
Appendix 12C:	Example: Summary for the Results, Discussion, and Conclusions for the Critical Thinking Skill
Appendix 13:	Background Information for Academic Program Assessment and Review
Appendix 14:	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 (2011-2016) in addition to the current one (2016-2017) 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 Schoenmann, Paul Schoenmann, and Shelby Zahn, 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. Commendations and Recommendations

2nd BS Speech Pathology & Audiology

Commendations:

The program continues to implement an outstanding assessment process that provides a range of kinds of data on student learning. The program is commended for addressing the following areas well:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:

- A very complete description of the PLOs and their meaning in the program was provided.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- The Learning Outcomes Assessment measure has been specifically designed to track student knowledge in critical domains as well as to measure student problem-solving.
- The program used a variety of direct and indirect measures to triangulate its results.
- A very complete description of the measures and the standards was provided.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:

- Program standards of performance have been set for all assessment data. Standards for both entry to and graduation from the program have been established.

Data Collection and Presentation:

- The data was presented in an easy-to-read form, including a data table.
- A thoughtful discussion of the data was provided.
- A norming procedure was used.

Use of Assessment Data:

- The program made thoughtful use of assessment data for many purposes.

Recommendations:

As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to pay attention to the following areas:

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:

- The program might consider augmenting the Learning Outcomes Assessment with analysis of strategically chosen key assignments to see how student performance in coursework compares with the results of the Learning Outcome Assessment. As we have mentioned before, using grades as assessment data is problematic because grades reflect more than student learning, including student compliance and the instructor's personal beliefs about grading systems. The Learning Outcomes Assessment is a good tool for measuring student learning; the program may want to supplement it with data from work students are already producing in their courses.

Data Collection and Presentation:

- If it is possible to get the scores from the Praxis disaggregated by domain, that could be very useful data for the program.

Use of Assessment Data:

- We encourage the program to look carefully at the results of the Learning Outcomes Assessment, and use a curriculum map to locate the places in the curriculum where instruction could be strengthened to improve student learning.

III. Detailed Feedback

Template Questions	Detailed Questions, Criteria, and Comments	
Q1: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) did you assess ?	See the assessment report Information literacy, quantitative literacy, overall disciplinary knowledge, “human cultures and the physical world”
	Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs/GLGs :	See the assessment report
	Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?	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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)?)	Yes
	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?	Yes
	Q1.5. Did your program use the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)? [See DegreeProfile.org]	Yes
	Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?	Yes
Q2: Standards of Performance/Expectation for the Selected PLO	Q2.1. Select OR type in ONE(1) PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you <i>checked the correct box</i> for this PLO in Q1.1):	See the assessment report Overall disciplinary knowledge

	Q2.1.1. Please provide more information about the specific PLO you've chosen in Q2.1.	See the assessment report
	Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO?	Yes
	Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standards of performance that you have developed for this PLO:	See the assessment report
	Q2.4. Please indicate where you have published the selected PLO:	See the assessment report
	Q2.5. Please indicate where you have published the standard of performance:	See the assessment report
	Q2.6. Please indicate where you have published the rubric:	See the assessment report
Q3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO	Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for the selected PLO?	Yes
	Q3.1.1. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?	6
	Q3.2. Was the data scored/evaluated for this PLO?	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 the assessment report
Q3A: 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?	Yes
	Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student	See the assessment report

	tests, etc.) were used? [Check all that apply]	
	Q3.3.2. Please provide the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN explain how it assesses the PLO:	See the assessment report The measures are described in detail
	Q3.4. <i>What tool was used to evaluate the data?</i>	Rubric pilot-tested and refined by group of faculty
	Q3.4.1. If you used other means, which of the following measures was used?	See the assessment report National disciplinary exams or licensure exams
	Q3.4.2. <i>Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</i>	Yes
	Q3.4.3. <i>Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</i>	Yes
	Q3.4.4. <i>Was the direct measure (e.g. assignments, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</i>	Yes
	Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?	See the assessment report All full-time faculty
	Q3.5.1. How many faculty members participated in the evaluation of the assessment data for the selected PLO?	See the assessment report All full-time faculty
	Q3.5.2. <i>If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?</i>	Yes
	Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?	See the assessment report
	Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?	See the assessment report

	Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?	29
	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?	24
	Q3.6.4. <i>Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?</i>	Yes
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)	Q3.7. <i>Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</i>	Yes
	Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]	See the assessment report College/department/program surveys or groups; advisory board surveys or groups
	Q3.7.1.1. Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:	See the assessment report
	Q3.7.2. If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided ?	See the assessment report
	Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you select your sample.	See the assessment report
	Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?	See the assessment report
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)	Q3.8. <i>Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO?</i>	Yes
	Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? [Check all that apply]	See the assessment report National disciplinary exams or licensure exams
	Q3.8.2. <i>Were other measures used to assess the PLO?</i>	No
	Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:	See the assessment report
Q4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions	Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and	See the assessment report Very clear data presentation

	conclusions for the selected PLO in Q2.1:	
	Q4.1a. Does the program explicitly assess the PLO?	Yes
	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?	See the assessment report A detailed analysis is provided
	Q4.2a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion?	Yes
	Q4.3. <i>For the selected PLO, what is the student performance:</i>	Exceeded expectation/standard
	Q4.3a. Can the readers come to the SAME conclusion as the program that students meet the expectations/standards for this learning outcome?	Partially While the students exceeded expectations in the summative measures, the Learning Outcomes Assessment yielded mixed results.
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>	Yes
	Q4.5. <i>Were all the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?</i>	No Grades are not a very useful kind of assessment data. We encourage the program to explore other avenues for directly measuring student learning such as key assignments, or obtaining Praxis scores disaggregated by domain (if available)
Q5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)	Q5.1. <i>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)?</i>	Yes
	Q5.1.1. Please describe <i>what changes</i> 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 the assessment report

	Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?	Yes
	Q5.2. Since your last assessment report, how have the assessment data from then been used so far?	See the assessment report
	Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.	See the assessment report
	Q5.3. To what extent did you apply last year's feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?	See the assessment report
	Q5.3.1. Please share with us an example of how you applied last year's feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:	See the assessment report
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.	See the assessment report
	Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [Check all that apply]	See the assessment report Eight PLOs
	Q8/8.1. Please list and attach any additional files here:	See the assessment report
Summary	S1. Does the program follow the template by answering where applicable?	Yes
	S2. Were the program's answers simple and clear?	Yes
	S3. Does the program assess the PLO using correct alignment of standard, rubric, and measure (Q3.4.2 - Q3.4.4)?	Yes

	<p><i>S4. Overall, do students partially meet, meet, or exceed program's standard of performance based on consultant's review?</i></p>	<p>Meet the expectation/standard Partially meet, though largely exceed.</p>
--	---	--

Appendix 1. Guidelines for Completing the Assessment Report Template


This template has two goals:

1. To help departments and programs think more critically about their assessment procedures, the use of assessment results, and to report more accurately the outcomes of those procedures.
2. To provide OAPA with the information necessary for reporting the campus assessment effort to our accreditation agency, WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC).


Based on user comments, revisions were made in last year's template to make the template easier to read and use. We also hope the current revision better reflects a focus on the whole assessment process, from the development of measurable Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), through the design of an appropriate and high-quality system for collecting and analyzing data, to the most important part of program assessment – the steps taken to improve the program and student learning.

Program review and assessment are based on Backward Design:

Backward Design for Assessment



Program assessment follows this basic flowchart:



Program assessment also follows the assessment paradigm shifts below:

1. Teaching Centered	Learning Centered	Partnership
Goals/Objectives	Goals/Outcomes	Goals/Outcomes
Teaching/Instructor focused	Learning/Student focused	Learning and Student focused
Implicit criteria/Standards	Explicit criteria/Standards	Explicit criteria/Standards
No rubrics or rubric developed by the course instructor	Rubrics developed by the program/university faculty	Rubrics developed by the program/university faculty, staff, and students
Data collected and analyzed by course instructor (course focused)	Data collected and analyzed by the program or university committee (program or university focused)	Data collected and analyzed by the program/ university committee, staff, and students
Assessment driven by instructor	Assessment driven by program faculty	Assessment driven by all stakeholders; (faculty, staff, administrators, and students)
2. Data collection	Use of data for improvement	Use of data for accountability
3. Indirect assessment	Direct assessment	Direct and indirect methods
4. Course assessment	Program assessment	University assessment
5. Content knowledge	Skills/Values	Application of knowledge and skills
6. Tests/Exams	Projects besides tests/exams	Internships besides projects and tests
7. Majors as frames of reference/different perspectives	Inter-disciplinary studies	Problem-based multi-disciplinary studies

These guidelines are organized to parallel the structure of the template, and are divided into four sections.

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1: This list of possible PLOs compiles the WSCUC Five Core Competencies, our Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs), and more specific learning outcomes that may be specific to your program. Check all that apply. If you did not collect data on PLO assessment, please skip to Q6.

Q1.2: Please provide your program's PLOs as stated in your most current assessment plan. If appropriate, add some explanation so that someone not in your field could understand that PLO. For general learning goals such as Critical Thinking, please define what that learning goal looks like in your discipline.

For example, Internet Master's in Educational Technology (iMET) has adopted language in Appendix 12A to come up with the following Critical Thinking learning outcome:

6: Graduate students from iMET will demonstrate a habit of systematically exploring issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion: (**PLO 6: Critical thinking** adopted from the VALUE rubric) they will...

6.1: Clearly state the issue/problem that needs to be considered critically, comprehensively describe the issue/problem, and deliver all relevant information necessary for a full understanding of the issue/problem (**Explanation of issues**);

6.2: Thoroughly interpret and evaluate the information taken from source(s) to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis (**Evidence**);

6.3: Thoroughly analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position (**Influence of context and assumptions**);

6.4: Consider the complexities (all sides) of an issue. Limits of position and others' points of view are acknowledged and synthesized within position (**Student's position including perspective, thesis/hypothesis**);

6.5: Form conclusions, consequences and implications that are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in order of priority (**Conclusions and related outcomes**).

Q1.2.1: Many programs develop their own, or adopt or modify the Association of American Colleges and University (AAC&U) VALUE rubrics to measure their student work. Rubrics usually pertain to a single PLO and contain dimensions of the PLO along with levels of achievement per dimension.

Q1.3: Find the University Mission Statement at <http://www.csus.edu/universitystrategicplan>.

Q1.4 & 1.4.1: You do not need to include the mission statement or learning outcomes of your accrediting agency with your Annual Assessment Report (AAR).

Q1.5: The Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) is a nationally recognized set of learning outcomes.

DQP Grid:

http://degreeprofile.org/press_four/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/DQP-grid-download.pdf

Full description of the DQP:

http://degreeprofile.org/press_four/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/DQP-web-download.pdf

Q1.6: When learning outcomes are phrased in broad terms such as “know” and “understand”, it is more difficult to measure student progress than when the learning outcome contains action verbs such as to **write, recite, identify, solve, construct, build, compare, or contrast**. See Appendices 10 and 11 for other examples of specific verbs to use. See examples in Q1.2. You can also find more information from the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics for measuring learning outcomes.

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

In Questions #2-5, programs will report in detail on one PLO that they have assessed. You will have an opportunity at the end of the template to report a summary of any other assessment work you did for any other PLOs, and for any other program improvement steps you took that are not directly connected to a PLO.

The purpose of questions 2-5 is three-fold:

1. To provide your program an opportunity to think critically about the process you are using to assess the PLOs for your program. We encourage you to think about whether the measures you are using and the tools (such as rubrics) that you use to evaluate that data actually address the PLO you are trying to measure. We also encourage you to think about the quality of the data you are collecting. If you are sampling a larger student population, *does the sample adequately represent all your students? Are all the evaluators using the same standards in scoring student work?*
2. To help your program “close the loop” and use assessment data to improve student learning in your program. Ultimately the goal of assessment is to improve program quality. Assessment should be a useful experience for your program, not just a hoop to jump through.
3. To provide OAPA with evidence of the nature of assessment on the campus. This evidence is used both to give feedback to programs on making their assessment process more useful to the program, and in reporting to the Chancellor’s office and outside agencies such as WSCUC.

Question 2: Standards of Performance for a Selected PLO

In addition to specifying what you want students to learn, you must specify what level of learning is acceptable for an **individual** student, and for **all** the students in your program. For example, the faculty in your program may agree that a score of 3 in all dimensions on a particular rubric is a reasonable standard to set for the students graduating from your BA program. As a program, you may decide that is a reasonable target that 70% of your students are scoring at this level or above, or you may adjust these targets over time, but it is essential to specify a target standard of performance for each PLO.

Q2.1: Please state which of the PLOs you described in Question 1 you are choosing to report in detail.

Q2.2: Answer the question **just for the selected PLO**. This is often simply stated as a percentage of students reaching a certain level of achievement on a rubric (e.g. 70% of students achieve a 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Critical Thinking VALUE rubric).

Q2.3: Describe/attach the **standard of performance AND the rubric**, criteria, or scoring device you used to evaluate the PLO. For purposes of program improvement, it is most useful to:

- Express the standard of performance as a percentage of students performing at a particular level, rather than as a mean.
- Use a scoring device (such as a rubric) that specifies varying levels of performance.
- See Appendix **12A** for an example.

Q2.4, Q2.5, & Q2.6: It is considered good assessment practice to make the learning goals, standards and measuring devices (such as rubrics) available for others to see, including students, other faculty, administrators and the public. This question asks about the range of ways in which this information might be published. It is not necessarily appropriate that all of your assessment information be published in all of these ways. The University does need to know in which ways this information is currently being communicated to others.

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality

The question differentiates between direct measures, indirect measures, and other measures. **Direct measures** are those that measure **student performance in their program**. These measures can include key assignments in courses within the program, performances in capstone projects, portfolios either within courses or as program culminating experiences, and the like.

Indirect measures are those that ask students and others for their **impression of your program**. The measuring device might be surveys, focus groups or interviews; those involved might include students, alumni, employers or others familiar with the program.

Your program may have access to **other measures** aside from student performance or survey data. Students in some programs undergo examinations for licensing or credentialing. In some fields there are recognized tests that can be used to compare student performance at different institutions. Some fields have specialized GREs or other achievement exams.

Q3.1 & 3.1.1: If data was collected, please indicate how many tools and/or classes were used. For example, a capstone portfolio might be one tool, and a key assignment in a specific course would be another.

Q3.2 & 3.2.1: Please describe how **all** assessment data for this PLO was collected.

Q3.3 & 3.3.1: Indicate if direct measures were used and what kind.

Question 3 (Q3). Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) **used to assess the PLOs**

This question is where you describe how you plan to align your data to your direct measure, using key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.

Q3.3.2. Please 1) **provide** and/or attach the direct measure you used to collect data, THEN 2) **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

Example Answer to Q3.3.2:

The key assignment for the iMET program assessment is the **Action Research Report**. iMET used this **Action Research Report** (Master's Thesis) included in an accessible ePortfolio as its direct measure to assess its Critical Thinking PLO.

This culminating experience report (the master thesis) includes the following tasks:

1. Designing and implementing a study using data collection tools that will allow the students to "show" the reader what happened during and as a result of the intervention.
2. Sorting through the findings after collecting the data, looking for data that reveal some information pertinent to the study.
3. Looking for relationships (patterns) between the data. These patterns emerge from a variety of sources such as things that have happened, things that students have observed, things that people have said, and things that students have measured. These are the findings (conclusions) of the study.

Q3.4: The VALUE rubrics are nationally recognized and can be used to measure various aspects of post-secondary education. We encourage your program to use VALUE rubrics where possible to assess your PLOs. Use of a common rubric allows us to aggregate data and understand more about student learning across the University, and to compare the performance of our students to students at other institutions. If you find that a particular VALUE rubric does not quite work for your PLO, perhaps some items on the rubric may work, and you can use a modified VALUE rubric. If the VALUE rubrics just won't work for your program, you might use a rubric from elsewhere. There are also some kinds of data for which a rubric is not needed (for example, student performance on a diagnostic exam).

Q3.4.2, Q3.4.3 & 3.4.4: Alignment: These questions investigate how well the direct measure you have chosen and the way you evaluate performance on the measure (using a rubric, setting criteria for evaluation, a grading sheet, etc.) actually measure progress on the PLO you are assessing. For example, if your PLO is addressing Critical Thinking, and your direct measure is a multiple choice test that measures Content Knowledge, then there is poor alignment between your goals and your instrument for measuring progress toward that goal. If your PLO addresses Civic Engagement, then the measure should address the aspect of Civic Engagement with which you are the most concerned.

Likewise, you should consider how well the device you are using to evaluate the direct measure actually fits the task students will be doing in that direct measure. For example, if your PLO addresses student competency in Writing in the discipline, and your measure asks students to write a technical report, then your rubric should apply to that kind of writing.

Finally, *does the rubric or other scoring device support the PLO?* For example, your PLO may call for students to be effective writers in the discipline. If your scoring device is much more heavily geared toward the mechanics of writing (spelling, punctuation, etc.) than toward the larger issues of writing (clarity, organization, depth of discussion), then it may not be accurately capturing progress toward becoming an effective writer.

Q3.4.2 asks you to consider the rubric or scoring device in light of the PLO. *Does that scoring device actually capture progress toward the PLO?*

Q3.4.3 asks whether the rubric or other scoring device is appropriate for the direct measure you are using.

Q3.4.4 is effectively asking, *does your direct measure actually measure student performance on this PLO?*

Q3.5 & 3.5.1: If you have a lot of data, or data from multiple sections of a course, or data from multiple assessment tools, you may have more than one person evaluating the data. A **norming process** helps ensure that everyone uses the same standards when scoring (unless your direct measure is a multiple choice exam of something similar). In a typical norming process, all the scorers score a select set of papers, and then compare their scores and discuss the results to help find consensus. Please enter the number.

Q3.6 - 3.6.4 Sampling: These questions investigate how you chose the samples of student work that were evaluated during this assessment process. Please enter the actual number for Q3.6.2 and Q3.6.3.

Q3.6: *What selection process did you use?* For example, a key assignment from every student in a specific class. If your program is large, you probably only chose some student work to examine for assessment. For example, perhaps you chose work from five students in five different sections.

Q3.6.1: Please explain your thinking in how the sample was selected.

Q3.6.2 - 3.6.4: These questions help us see how the size of your sample compare to the amount of student work that was available to sample. *Do you think your sample was adequate to accurately represent student performance in your program?*

Q3.7 - 3.8.3: These questions address **indirect measures**, such as surveys, focus groups and interviews, and **any other measures**, like external benchmarking or licensing exams. Please be sure to **attach copies** of any indirect or other measures used.

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions and Quality of Assessment

This question is where you present your data. You may paste data tables into the form or attach documents.

Q4.1: Data should be presented in clear, easy-to-read tables. The most useful way to present the data is as **percentages** of students scoring at various levels of performance. If a rubric is used, show the percentage of students scoring at each level of the rubric. If the data is something like test scores, break out student performance at **different percentage levels** (e.g., % of students scoring 0-20%, 20-40%, etc.). This kind of data presentation gives a more complete picture of student performance than simply presenting averages. Please see Appendix 12C for an example.

Table 1: Summary for the Results, Discussion, and Conclusions for the Critical Thinking Skill

Different Levels Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)	Total (N=130)
6.1: Explanation of Issues	38%	54%	0%	8%	(100%, N=130)
6.2: Evidence	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.4: Student's Position	23%	54%	8%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.5: Conclusions and Related Outcomes	15%	54%	15%	15%	(100%, N=130)

Q4.2: This question refers to the program standard of performance (Question 2). Please detail how students are meeting or not meeting the standard, and plans to improve student performance. See Appendix 12C for an example.

We can see from Table 1 above that students meet the criteria of 6.1 (92%) and 6.4 (77%) based on the assessment of our selected Critical Thinking PLO and our identified program standard of performance (70% of students should achieve a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Critical Thinking Rubric). Students do not meet the criteria of 6.2 (61%), 6.3 (61%), and 6.5 (69%). **Students meet some of our program standards for the Critical Thinking Skill, thus they “Partially Met Program Standards.”** Two areas need improvement: 1) Criterion 6.2: Evidence (61%), and 2) Criterion 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (61%).

In order to help students in our program successfully become researchers with critical thinking skills, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1) Re-examination of evidence (6.2) and context and assumptions (6.3) in the research, and 2) Require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments.

Q4.3: Indicate the level of student performance.

Q4.4 & 4.5: Please evaluate how well your assessment process actually measured what you set out to measure. *Did all of your tools align with the PLO you set to measure? Were all of these tools useful and accurate ways to measure that PLO?*

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data

Perhaps the most important component of program assessment is using the results to improve instruction and the program as a whole. Please tell us how your results will be, and have been, used.

Q5.1: Tell us about your program’s plans based **on the current year’s** assessment results.

Q5.1.1: Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

Example Answer to Q5.1.1:

In order to help students in our program successfully become Critical Thinking researchers, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1) Re-examining evidence (6.2) and context and assumptions (6.3) in the research, and 2) Requiring students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments.

Note: The following provide you examples of use of assessment data:

Q5.2. <i>To what extent did you apply previous assessment results collected through your program in the following areas?</i>	(1) <i>Very Much</i>	(2) <i>Quite a Bit</i>	(3) <i>Some</i>	(4) <i>Not at all</i>	(8) <i>N/A</i>
<i>1. Improving specific courses</i>					
<i>2. Modifying curriculum</i>					
<i>3. Improving advising and mentoring</i>					
<i>4. Revising learning outcomes/goals</i>					
<i>5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations</i>					
<i>6. Developing/updating assessment plan</i>					
<i>7. Annual assessment reports</i>					
<i>8. Program review</i>					
<i>9. Prospective student and family information</i>					
<i>10. Alumni communication</i>					
<i>11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)</i>					
<i>12. Program accreditation</i>					
<i>13. External accountability reporting requirement</i>					
<i>14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations</i>					
<i>15. Strategic planning</i>					
<i>16. Institutional benchmarking</i>					
<i>17. Academic policy development or modification</i>					
<i>18. Institutional Improvement</i>					
<i>19. Resource allocation and budgeting</i>					
<i>20. New faculty hiring</i>					
<i>21. Professional development for faculty and staff</i>					
<i>22. Recruitment of new students</i>					
<i>23. Other Specify:</i>					

Q5.2: Tell us how **previous assessment results** have been used.

Q5.3: Tell us how **previous assessment feedback** has been used.

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Question 6: Other Assessment Activities

In this question, please provide any other assessment activities that are not reported above.

Q6: Sometimes programs/academic units conduct assessment of elements of their program not related to PLOs (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results.


Q6.1: Explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** are associated with any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university.

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

See the template for more details.

Appendix 2: Principles for Program Assessment and Review

(Updated on 10/23/2017)



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

Principle 1 (Q1) Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

PLO Comprehensive List

See WSCUC Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes (Appendix 3) for more details.

- What are your PLOs: *what should your students know, value, and be able to do (at the time of graduation)?*

Assessable Outcomes

- *Is each program learning outcome assessable?*
- *What **action verbs** are used?*

Alignment

- *Is each PLO **aligned closely** with the curriculum, the key assignment, the rubric, pedagogy, grading, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?*
- *Are the PLOs **aligned closely** with the mission of the university and the program/department/college?*

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?*

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 PLOs published for view, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs?*

Principle 2 (Q2) Standards of Performance (Expectations)/Rubrics:

See WSCUC Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes (Appendix 3) for more details.

- *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**?
- Are **rubrics** needed to assess the PLOs? If yes, what rubrics are used to assess a particular PLO?
- 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?

Principle 3 (Q3) Measures Used:

Relevant outcomes and lines of evidence identified. See Appendices 4 and 5 for more details.

- What **direct measures** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) are used to collect the data?
- Is relevant evidence collected?
- 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?
- Are external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?
- Which **other measures** (national disciplinary, state/professional licensure exams, general knowledge and skills measures, other standardized knowledge and skill exams, etc.) are used?

Principle 4 (Q4) Data and Findings:

See Appendices 4 and 5 for more details.

Are the results reliable and valid?

- **What are the data, analyses, and findings for EACH PLO?**
- **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?
- 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?

Principle 5 (Q5) Use of Data:

See Appendices 4 and 5 for more details.

Are the results used?

- **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?
- **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 3: 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 4: 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 5: 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 6: 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 7: 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 8: 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	(Sixteenth 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 9: Graduate Learning Goals Policy

Departments/interdisciplinary groups with graduate programs in their purview shall be required to establish Graduate Goals, Program Learning Outcomes with an associated curriculum map, and an assessment plan with an associated action plan, to be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies. These documents must be reviewed and, if necessary, updated by May 30 of each academic year.

The Institutional Graduate Learning Goals listed in Section A express a shared, campus-wide articulation of minimum requirements for recipients of graduate degrees. Each graduate program may set Program Learning Goals in addition to the required Institutional Graduate Learning Goals.

A. Institutional Graduate Learning Goals

For each Institutional Graduate Learning Goal, students are expected to achieve a level of competency associated with an advanced degree, as appropriate to the discipline.

Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Masters Programs

1. **Disciplinary knowledge:** Master, integrate, and apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to current, practical, and important contexts and situations.
2. **Communication:** Communicate key knowledge with clarity and purpose both within the discipline and in broader contexts.
3. **Critical thinking/analysis:** Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.
4. **Information literacy:** Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad of sources.
5. **Professionalism:** Demonstrate an understanding of professional integrity.
6. **Intercultural/Global Perspectives:** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and application of intercultural and/or global perspectives.

Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Doctoral Programs

All of the above Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Masters Programs, with the addition of:

7. **Research:** Conduct independent research resulting in an original contribution to knowledge in the focused areas of their graduate program.

B. Program Learning Outcomes

Graduate programs shall develop Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that represent their unique perspectives and which demonstrate achievement of Graduate Learning Goals. Each graduate program shall define its own set of learning outcomes, specific to the level of study and to the discipline, which are clearly more advanced in content than those defined for related undergraduate work. For some programs, these might already be defined, at least in part, by external accrediting agencies. Such defined outcomes shall also form the basis for assessment plans within graduate programs and offer foci for future academic Program Review teams.

Program Learning Outcomes are designed with the goal of placing graduated master's or doctoral students into post-degree positions in secondary education, non-profits, business and consulting, government and private agencies, and other fields that draw on the knowledge and skills of graduates in the focused areas of their degree preparation.

C. Curriculum Map

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 in the example below:

Curriculum Map

Coursework	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	PLO 6
GRAD 201 (core course)	X		X			
GRAD 202 (core course)				X		X
GRAD 203 (core course)		X		X		
GRAD 204 (core course)	X				X	
GRAD 205 (core course)			X			
GRAD 206 (core course)	X	X	X	X		
GRAD 252 (elective)	X				X	
GRAD 252 (elective)		X				X
GRAD 500 Culminating Experience	X	X	X	X	X	X

D. Assessment Plan

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

1. Identify graduate program-specific direct and indirect lines of evidence for each of the PLOs. The table below summarizes the kinds of direct and indirect evaluative data programs might draw on to assess PLOs related to two of the Institutional Graduate Learning Goals:

		Lines of Evidence (Examples for Assessing Graduate Program Learning Outcomes)	
<i>Institutional Graduate Goal</i>	<i>PLO</i>	<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>
Disciplinary Knowledge	1. PLO1 2. PLO2 3. PLO3	1. Assignments in core courses 2. Completion of culminating experience	1. Mid-course assessments 2. Program exit interview 3. Alumni survey
Communication	1. PLO1 2. PLO2	1. Assignments in content courses 2. Early writing assessment 3. Pre-Candidacy project or examination 4. Presentation at scholarly meetings or in colloquia series 5. Papers/articles/books/grants 6. Thesis or Doctoral dissertation proposal 7. Culminating experience Doctoral dissertation	1. Mid-course assessments 2. Program exit interview 3. Alumni survey

2. Articulate evaluation parameters for measuring introductory and advanced levels of graduate student development for each PLO.
3. Evaluate each of the PLOs based on direct lines of evidence such as those identified above, 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.

E. Action Plan Based on Assessment Data

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

FS 15-16-115 Approved by the Faculty Senate, April 21, 2016. Approved by President Nelsen, June 3, 2016. Revises FS 14/15-166 Approved by the Faculty Senate May 7, 2015 Supersedes FS 11/12-112, which was approved by the Faculty Senate April 5, 2012

Appendix 10: The Importance of Action Verbs

The Importance of Action <u>Verbs</u> (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 11: 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 12A: Example: The VALUE Rubric for the Critical Thinking Skill

Criterion	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)
6.1: Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
6.2: Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions).
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

An example of the Program Standard of Performance for the Critical Thinking PLO:

Seventy percent (70%) of our students should achieve a score of **at least 3 in all dimensions** of the above rubric by the time of graduation.

The program standard of performance helps programs identify how *well* students perform within and across the program learning outcome (PLO).

Appendix 12B.1: Example: Data Collection Sheet for the Critical Thinking Skill Individual Level

Student A in Your Program

Different Levels	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)
Five Criteria (Areas)				
6.1: Explanation of Issues	4	3	2	1
6.2: Evidence	4	3	2	1
6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions	4	3	2	1
6.4: Student's Position	4	3	2	1
6.5: Conclusions and Related Outcomes	4	3	2	1

You can use the rubric to collect data for each student. In this example, Student A achieved a score of 4 for criteria 6.1 and 6.3, a score of 3 for criteria 6.2 and 6.5, and a score of 2 for criterion 6.4.

Appendix 12B.2: Example: Raw Data Summary for the Critical Thinking Skill for the Program Program Level

Your Program

Different Levels	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)	Total (N=130)
Five Criteria (Areas)					
6.1: Explanation of Issues	49	71	0	10	(100%, N=130)
6.2: Evidence	19	61	31	19	(100%, N=130)
6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions	19	61	31	19	(100%, N=130)
6.4: Student's Position	30	71	10	19	(100%, N=130)
6.5: Conclusions and Related Outcomes	19	71	21	19	(100%, N=130)

You can use the rubric to summarize your data of student work. For example, 49 students achieved Capstone 4 for criterion 6.1, and 10 students achieved Milestone 2 for criterion 6.4.

Appendix 12B.3: Example: Data Summary for the Critical Thinking Skill for the Program Program Level

Your Program

Different Levels	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)	Total (N=130)
Five Criteria (Areas)					
6.1: Explanation of Issues	38% (N= 49/130)	54%	0%	8%	(100%, N=130)
6.2: Evidence	15%	46%	24%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions	15%	46%	24%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.4: Student's Position	23%	54%	8% (N = 10/130)	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.5: Conclusions and Related Outcomes	15%	54%	16%	15%	(100%, N=130)

For direct and simple comparison, you can use percentages to summarize your data. For example, 38% of the students achieved Capstone 4 for criterion 6.1, and 8% of the students achieved Milestone 2 for criterion 6.4.

Appendix 12C: Example: Summary for the Results, Discussion, and Conclusions for the Critical Thinking Skill

Different Levels Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone = (4)	Milestone = (3)	Milestone = (2)	Benchmark = (1)	Total (N=130)
6.1: Explanation of Issues	38%	54%	0%	8%	(100%, N=130)
6.2: Evidence	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.3: Influence of Context and Assumptions	15%	46%	23%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.4: Student's Position	23%	54%	8%	15%	(100%, N=130)
6.5: Conclusions and Related Outcomes	15%	54%	16%	15%	(100%, N=130)

We can see (using the above table) that students meet the criteria of 6.1 (92%), 6.4 (77%), and 6.5 (69%) based on the assessment of our selected Critical Thinking PLO and our identified program standard of performance (70% of students should achieve a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Critical Thinking Rubric). Students do not meet the criteria of 6.2 (61%) and 6.3 (61%). **Students meet some of our program standards for the Critical Thinking Skill, thus they “Partially Met Program Standards.”** Two areas need improvement: 1) Criterion 6.2: Evidence (61%), and 2) Criterion 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (61%).

In order to help students in our program successfully become researchers with critical thinking skills, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1) Re-examination of evidence (6.2) and context and assumptions (6.3) in the research, and 2) Require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments.

Appendix 13: 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 programs 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 14: 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.