2017 - 2018
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information 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 enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

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**]

- [x] 1. **Critical Thinking**
- [x] 2. **Information Literacy**
- [x] 3. **Written Communication**
- [x] 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
- [x] 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- [ ] 13. Ethical Reasoning
- [ ] 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- [x] 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- [ ] 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- [ ] 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- [x] 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- [x] 19. **Professionalism**
- [ ] 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. Advanced educational technology knowledge
b. Educational technolog contributions and applications
c. Challenges in educational technology

- [ ] 20B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs**. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.2 to Q5.3.1.)

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**:

For assessing the PLOs nad GLGs an ePortfolio is used, a summative assessment which includes an action research report and artifacts that students choose from among the courses they have taken throughout the program. Assignments or artifacts meet the various GLGs as well as the PLOs. The PLOs had not been explicitly linked to the the Sac State GLGs. However, in the newly revised program which was approved in March 2018, work is being one in the summer of 2018 to map out how courses' outcomes and objectives are aligned to program outcomes including the GLOs. and PLOs. Additionally, new PLOs are being developed.

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:

I do not have the rubrics for the old program and the rubrics for each of the assignments PLOs, but …

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)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

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):

Overall Disciplinary Knowledge

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

Critical Thinkining Analysis

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

Critical thinking/analysis: Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.

Students created a professional poster and presented the poster in the year-end poster symposium.

Q2.2.
Has the program developed or adopted ***explicit program standards of performance/expectations*** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

- (•) 1. Yes
- ( ) 2. No
- ( ) 3. Don't know
- ( ) 4. N/A

Q2.3.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the rubric(s) AND 2) the standards of performance/expectations** that you have developed for *the selected PLO* here:

Attached is the rubric which describes the standards of performance.

Poster Rubric(2).pdf
81.93 KB

No file attached

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

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:

For example, student posters of their research were showcased and presented in person at the semester-end poster symposium. Program Faculty evaluated individual student's presentation and poster. A rubric was used. This was accomplished in the EDTE 285 course.

(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**]

- [x] 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
- [x] 6. E-Portfolios
- [ ] 7. Other Portfolios
- [ ] 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.
Please **1) provide and/or attach the direct measure** (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, **THEN 2) explain here** how it assesses the PLO:

For example, student posters of their research were showcased and presented in person at the semester-end poster symposium. Faculty evaluated individual student's presentation and poster. A rubric was used.

Poster Rubric Student Sample.pdf
215.3 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.
Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

1

Q3.5.1.

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

4

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.)?

The assignment was a common artifact of the students' eportfolio. It was based on the students' culminating experience.

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

Six, based on availability.

Q3.6.2.
Please enter the number (#) of students that were in the class or program?

8

Q3.6.3.
Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that 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, please enter 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 tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our Feedback Packet Example):

For the class (6 students) the average overall score (5 highest score possible), the average overall score was 4.4, ranging from 3.5 to 5.0. Per rubric criteria, the average scores per criteria ranged from 4.0 to 4.8. Two criteria acheive average scores of 4.8, that of "presence" and "knowledge of project." The lowest average score was 4.0 out of 5, that of "results." We will look at expected outcomes of analyzing research results to further help students.

average scores poster.xlsx
11.16 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

No file attached

No file attached

Q4.3.
For the selected PLO, the student performance:

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

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

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

- 1. Yes

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

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

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

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

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate ***making any changes*** for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

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

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

The program was revised and approved for revisions in March 2018. Work is being done in the summer of 2018 and on to align and document all information pertaining to reporting and assessing all goals, outcomes and objectives, including course activities, assessments, activities and materials.

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

- 1. Yes, describe your plan:

In progress.

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous**	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.

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

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

As I mentioned above, use of assessment data is being evaluated in the development of comprehensive approaches to assessing a new program and developing the new program.

Q5.3. To what extent did you apply **previous assessment 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	○	○	○	◉	○
2. Standards of Performance	○	○	○	◉	○
3. Measures	○	○	○	◉	○
4. Rubrics	○	○	○	◉	○
5. Alignment	○	○	○	◉	○
6. Data Collection	○	○	○	◉	○
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	○	○	◉	○
8. Use of Assessment Data	○	○	○	◉	○
9. Other, please specify:	○	○	○	◉	○

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

I was the new coordinator of the program and am focusing all efforts on the development of the new iMET program. At this time we are evaluating prior course outcomes, etc. to draw from in acheiving new program outcomes that are aligned with the GLGs, the mission of the University, and the mission of the College of Education.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.
If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

n/a

No file attached No file attached

Q6.1.
Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to 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:

n/a

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 explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

The ond program was significantly revised on recommendation from the College.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

No file attached | No file attached

No file attached | No file attached

Q9.1.
If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

Q10.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]
MA iMet

Q11.
Report Author(s):
Mark Rodriguez

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:
Elisabeth Liles

Q11.2.
Assessment Coordinator:
N/A

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):
Education - Graduate

Q13.
College:
College of Education

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):
526

Q15.
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:

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?
Don't know

Q16.1. List all the names:

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?
Don't know

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?
Don't know

Q17.1. List all the names:

Education

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?
Don't know

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?
Don't know

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?
Don't know

Q19.1. List all the names:

When was your **Assessment Plan**...	1. Before 2012-13	2. 2013-14	3. 2014-15	4. 2015-16	5. 2016-17	6. 2017-18	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q20. Developed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Q20.1. Last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

1617 ma imet ogs plan.pdf
78.32 KB

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**

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

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

No file attached

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

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

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?

- ◉ 1. Yes, specify:

EDTE 298 (new program to start fall 2018)

- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?

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

(**Remember**: **Save your progress**)
Save When Completed!

ver. 10.**31**.17

Judging Rubric for Poster Presentation of Research

Score	Hypothesis / Goals and Background	Results	Conclusions and Future Work	Poster Board
5	• Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. • Project had a goal or a logical hypothesis that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance. • Broad impact beyond project clearly stated.	• Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or goal of project. • Presentation of data was clear, thorough and logical. • Potential problems and alternative approaches.	• Reasonable conclusions were given and strongly supported with evidence. • Conclusion was connected to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed.	• All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is concise, free of spelling or typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. • Figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance visual appeal.
4	• A logical hypothesis or goal was presented. • Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. • Goal of project or a logical hypothesis was stated clearly, showed relevance beyond project.	• Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address the hypothesis or goal of project. • Presentation of data was clear and logical.	• Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence. • Conclusion was connected to hypothesis or project goals but their relevance was not discussed.	• All components are present, but layout is crowded or confusing to follow in absence of presenter. • Text is relatively clear, mostly free of spelling and typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. • Most figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding.
3	• A questionable hypothesis or project goal was presented. • Background information was relevant, but connections were not made.	• Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals. • Presentation of data was not entirely clear.	• Reasonable conclusions were given. • Conclusions were not compared to the hypothesis or project goal and their relevance was not discussed.	• Most expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is relatively clear, but some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. • Figures and tables not always related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.
2	• A questionable hypothesis was presented and was not well supported or the goal of the project was not clear.	• Some data were lacking, not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goal. • Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend.	• Conclusions were given. • Little connection to hypothesis or goal was apparent.	• Some expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is hard to read due to font size or color, some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. • Figures and tables not related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.

1	• The hypothesis or goal was inappropriate or not stated. • Little or no background information was included or connected.	• Results are not yet available or reproducible. • Presentation of data was missing.	• Conclusions were missing. • There was no connection with the hypothesis or project goal.	• Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text hard to read, messy and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors; very poor background. • Figures and tables poorly done. • Visual aids not used.

Judging Rubric for Presenter

Score	Knowledge of Project	Logical Presentation	Background Information	Presence
5	Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly.	Presentation is consistently clear and logical. Comfortably uses visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the research project and project background.	Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact.
4	Answers most questions.	Presentation is clear for the most part, but not consistently. Comfortably uses visual aids (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates a good knowledge of the research project and project background.	Speaks clearly, naturally; makes eye contact.
3	Has some difficulty answering challenging questions.	Presentation is generally unclear and inconsistent. Uses some visual aids (poster) to enhance presentation.	Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project and project background.	Reads from poster or script some of the time.
2	Has difficulty answering challenging questions.	Presentation unclear and illogical. Does not use visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation effectively.	Demonstrates poor knowledge of the research project.	Reads from the poster or script most of the time.
1	Does not understand questions.	Presentation very confusing. Does not use the visual aid (poster) to enhance presentation effectively.	Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project.	Reads from poster or script all of the time.

From Q4.1, Average Scores Poster

Students	Hypothesis / Goals	Results	Conclusions/future work	Poster Board	Knowledge of Project	Logical Presentation	Background Information	Presence	Average
1	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.9
2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.0
3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4.8
5	3	2	3	4	5	3	3	5	3.5
6	5	3	4	5	5	5	4	5	4.5
Average Score	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.8	4.4

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

Prepared by Chia-Jung Chung
Coordinator, iMet Program

Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

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

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

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

Curriculum Map

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

Each program shall create a curriculum map:

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

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

Assessment Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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