

2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

MA iMet

OR

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

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?** [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☒ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. Global Learning and Perspectives
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☐ 18. Overall Disciplinary Knowledge
- ☐ 19. Professionalism
- ☐ 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

Q1.2

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

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3 2		Benchmark 1
2.1 Attribution	Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents sources consistently and completely • Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently • Cites non-textual sources consistently • Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. • Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies • Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency • Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. • Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes • Does not consistently cite non-textual sources • Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently. 	Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation • Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes • Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources • Does not name or label figures and/or graphs.
2.2 Evaluation and use of sources	Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship • Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources • Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues • Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim • Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	Source materials used are inadequate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) • Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources • Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Clearly selected sources out of convenience • Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation 	Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) • When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate • No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for • No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- ☐ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ☒ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ☐ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

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

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

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

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

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

Information Literacy

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

Q2.1.1.

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

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

Q2.2.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☐ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

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

see attached



plo information literacy rubric.pdf
142.6 KB



No file attached

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

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

Q3.1.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.1.1.

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

1

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

Students in iMet program completed their Master thesis and eportfolio in EDTE 507: Culminating Experience. The Information Literacy rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 6 students review of literature in their action research report from EDTE 507: Culminating Experiences Educational Technology offered in spring 2017. The program advising team is made up of 4 faculty members. The program coordinator determined the final scores for program assessment purpose. We have discovered excellent insight into students Information Literacy skill.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

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

Q3.3.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to Q3.7)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?
[Check all that apply]

- ☒ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects

☐ 6. E-Portfolios

☐ 7. Other Portfolios

☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **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:

The Review of Literature in Master action research report (capstone project) as the direct measure to assessment this PLO . Please the attached description of the assessment. Information literacy rubric was applied to assess.



Key%20Assessment%20for%20the%20iMET%20Program.docx
49.87 KB



No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☒ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

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

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☐ 4. N/A

Q3.5.

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

One

Q3.5.1.

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

One

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know
☒ 4. N/A

Q3.6.

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

Students' action research reports were selected.

Q3.6.1.

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

Based on availability.

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

10

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

6

Q3.6.4.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)**Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)****Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

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

- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- ☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- ☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

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

 No file attached No file attached**Q3.7.2.**

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

Q3.7.3.

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

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

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

Q3.8.

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

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

Q3.8.1.

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

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


Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

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

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



4.10.png
230.48 KB



No file attached

Q4.2.

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

Yes, see attached.



4.20.png
80.59 KB



No file attached

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

☐

1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard

- ☒ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ☐ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ☐ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ☐ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.

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

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

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

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ☒ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

Q5.1.2.

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

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

Q5.2.

Since your last assessment report, how have the assessment data from then been used so far?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
23. Other, specify:	<input type="text"/>				

Q5.2.1.

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

The former iMET coordinator was on sabbatical and I am new to the program not having taught in the program for three years. Will be further assessing the program this upcoming 2017-18 academic year. An iMET program for the 2017-18 AY will not be offered as this program will be further evaluated and revised.

Q5.3.To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

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:

Data unavailable. Faculty who taught were at the time of the report being developed---unavailable.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

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



No file attached



No file attached

Q7.

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

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading

- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- ☐ 19. **Professionalism**
- ☐ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

 No file attached  No file attached  No file attached  No file attached

Q8.1.

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

1. PLO Informatino Literacy
2. key Assessment....
3. 4.10
4. 4.20
5. Graduate Learning Goals

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

Q9.

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

MA iMet

Q10.

Report Author(s):

Mark Rodriguez

Q10.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Elisabeth Liles

Q10.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Albert Lozano

Q11.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Graduate

Q12.

College:

College of Education

Q13.

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

20 from 2 iMET cohorts

Q14.

Program Type:

- ☐ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ☐ 2. Credential
- ☒ 3. Master's Degree
- ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q15. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

Q15.1. List all the names:**Q15.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

Don't know

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q16.1. List all the names:

iMET

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

Don't know

Q17. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q18. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q18.1. List all the names:

When was your assessment plan ...	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q19. developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Q19.1. last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Q19.2. (REQUIRED)

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:



Graduate%20Learning%20Goals_Objectives%20iMET%202015_16.docx
25.82 KB

Q20.

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

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☒ 3. Don't know

Q20.1.

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:



No file attached

Q21.

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

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

☒ 3. Don't know

Q22.

Does your program have a capstone class?

☒ 1. Yes, indicate:

☐ 2. No

☐ 3. Don't know

Q22.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

☒ 1. Yes

☐ 2. No

☐ 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3 2	
2.1 Attribution	<p>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents sources consistently and completely • Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently • Cites non-textual sources consistently • Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	<p>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. • Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies • Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency • Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. 	<p>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. • Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes • Does not consistently cite non-textual sources • Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.
2.2 Evaluation and use of sources	<p>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship • Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources • Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	<p>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues • Sources are used to support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim • Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author 	<p>Source materials used are inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature and other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) • Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources • Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) • Clearly selected sources out of convenience • Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation

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

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

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

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

Format:

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

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

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

Literature Review Template

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

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

In general, the following Conventions of style in research and reporting should be followed:

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

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

The general format of your essay should:

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

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

Paper Title (This is your introduction section)	
Review of Literature	
Level 2 Heading	
Level 2 Heading	
Level 2 Heading	
Level 3 heading.	
Level 3 heading.	
Level 2 Heading	
Major Themes	
Discussion	
References	
Appendixes	

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

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy (iMet)

Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

Prepared by Chia-Jung Chung
Coordinator, iMet Program

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

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

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

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

Curriculum Map

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge

PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications

PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology

PLO 4: Written communication

PLO 5: Oral communication

PLO 6: Critical thinking

PLO 7: Information literacy

PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis

PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency

Each program shall create a curriculum map:

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

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

Assessment Plan

PLO 1: Advanced educational technology knowledge (K)

PLO 2: Educational technology contributions and applications (A)

PLO 3: Challenges in educational technology (C)

PLO 4: Written communication (W)

PLO 5: Oral communication (O)

PLO 6: Critical thinking (CT)

PLO 7: Information literacy (IL)

PLO 8: Integrated learning through inquiry and analysis (IA)

PLO 9: Intercultural Knowledge and Competency (IC)

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

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

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

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

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

Action Plan

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

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

[illegible]

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
2.1 Attribution	<p>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents sources consistently and completely Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently Cites non-textual sources consistently Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. <p>33%</p>	<p>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies. Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. <p>33%</p>	<p>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes Does not consistently cite non-textual sources Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently. <p>33%</p>	<p>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources Does not name or label figures and/or graphs. <p>33% 0%</p>
2.2 Evaluation and use of sources	<p>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author <p>33%</p>	<p>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author <p>33%</p>	<p>Source materials used are inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Clearly selected sources out of convenience Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation <p>33%</p>	<p>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s) When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion) Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others <p>0</p>

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

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

	Total % of Students Who score 3.0 or above	Met the Standard or not? (Standard: 65 % of our second year graduate students should score 3.0 or above by the time of their graduation.)
Attribution	100	Met
Evaluation and use of sources	100	Met