

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:

BS Gerontology

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]

- 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**
- 20A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

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**:

Civic knowledge and engagement is part of Personal and Social Responsibility (Values), the fourth Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goal for the 21st Century. Among the Gerontology Competencies for Undergraduate and Graduate Education adopted by the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE) are the following competencies related to civic engagement:

- Engage, through effective communication older persons, their families and the community, in personal and public issues in aging (II.3)
- Engage collaboratively with others to promote integrated approaches to aging (II.4)
- Employ and design programmatic and community development with and on behalf of the aging population (III.3)
- Employ and generate policy to equitably address the needs of older persons (III.7)

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**)

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):

Civic Knowledge and Engagement

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.

The Gerontology Department examined recent graduating majors' skills and knowledge related to civic engagement necessary to be successful civic leaders, professionals, and informed citizens in a diverse national and global society.

Civic knowledge and engagement are part of all gerontology coursework. The year-long practicum (GERO 130 and GERO 131) offers students the opportunity to apply what they have learned in prior courses by interning with local aging services agencies and by designing, implementing, and evaluating a substantive service project. In these paired capstone courses required for all Gerontology majors, students spend at least 220 hours at their placement agencies, meet monthly in small groups with faculty members, and complete graded written work that includes regular journals, peer-reviewed article analyses, and other assignments designed to deepen their understanding of gerontology theory, practice, and policy issues at the local, state, national, and international levels.

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:

See attached Appendix A

 Appendix A Rubric_Standards_table.docx
19.49 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:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input checked="" 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: <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>

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:

Data were collected through written evaluations of GERO 131 students completed by Practicum Site Supervisors at the end of the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters. These data provided an external perspective of graduating majors' preparedness for civic engagement from aging services professionals who worked closely with these students over the course of a year.

Practicum site supervisors rated the students on 19 performance standards relevant to Civic Knowledge and Engagement. A 5-point Likert scale was used (1=Poor: student has difficulty grasping concepts, 2=Fair: student grasps idea, but does not demonstrate competency, 3=Good: student demonstrates beginning competence, 4=Excellent: student demonstrates competency but not consistency, 5=Exemplary: student demonstrates competency coherently and consistently as an integrated part of the student's performance).

(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 **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:

The attached written evaluation form (Appendix B) asked Practicum Site Supervisors to rate the Gerontology students who had been interning with their agencies for one year on 19 competencies related to preparedness for civic engagement. Students and Practicum Site Supervisors met to discuss the feedback provided in the evaluation.



Appendix B Practicum Supervisor Evaluation of Student_131.docx
18.01 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?

Q3.5.1.

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

Q3.5.2.

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

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

Q3.6.

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

All Gerontology majors who completed GERO 131 in either the Fall of 2017 or the Spring of 2018 were included. Gerontology minors were not included.

Q3.6.1.

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

Typically, GERO 131 is taken in the final semester prior to graduation. Therefore, the evaluation data collected on GERO 131 students capture their readiness for effective civic engagement towards the end of their Gerontology undergraduate studies. All GERO 131 students who were Gerontology majors and for whom practicum supervisor evaluations were available were included.

Q3.6.2.

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

Q3.6.3.

Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work that you evaluated?

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:

NA

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q3.7.2.

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

NA

Q3.7.3.

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

NA

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:

NA

 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](#)):

see attached Appendix C

 No file attached

 Appendix C Summary_Data.docx
13.76 KB


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?

Overall, students were rated highly by the practicum site supervisors on the knowledge and skills necessary for effective civic engagement.

To strengthen students' *Civic Communication* skills, faculty will review existing assignments in both GERO 130 and 131 to identify where more emphasis on verbal and written communication could be placed. Students enrolled in these courses already complete a number of substantive written assignments (weekly journals, peer-reviewed article analyses, project proposal, etc.) as well as give presentations about their projects at the culmination of the practicum. However, there may be opportunities to introduce more structured feedback on written and verbal communication within these current assignments.

Similarly, opportunities to support and encourage self-reflection will be explored. Currently, the primary mechanisms for self-reflection are the weekly journal entries and evaluations completed by the students, site supervisors, and faculty. Gerontology faculty will review these to identify ways they may be improved. For example, we may want to ask site supervisors to provide more concrete feedback in their mid-semester and final student evaluations regarding what students could do to improve and grow as future professionals and leaders.

 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.

1. Place more emphasis on verbal and written communication in existing assignments, including more structured feedback on student writing and presentation skills.
2. Consider revising evaluation forms.

Q5.1.2.

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

- 1. Yes, describe your plan:

Knowledge and skills relating to Civic Engagement will continue to be assessed in subsequent years, including in next year's Annual Assessment and Program Assessment. This assessment will be expanded to measure intra-individual change between the first semester of the practicum (GERO 130) and the second semester of the practicum (GERO131) as well as trends across several years. In addition. The qualitative feedback provided by practicum supervisors will be included in future analysis.

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Alumni communication	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5.2.1.

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

1. Modified some course content, including assignments, readings, and rubrics
2. Continued to expand and diversify Practicum placement sites and other service learning opportunities
3. Strengthened student mentoring through faculty training
4. Discussed in faculty meetings
5. Modified course and assignment rubrics as needed
6. Used in yearly review, course discussions, and when modifying the Assessment Plan
7. Analyzed data and completed report; planned for next year's assessment
8. Will use in upcoming Program Review
9. Briefly discuss PLOs and relevant skills/competencies as well as integrated, applied nature of core courses in orientation and advising sessions
10. Used PLO data in Program Review Alumni Survey
11. NA
12. NA
13. Aligned with national competency standards
14. NA
15. Used PLO and data to guide discussion of future of program
16. NA
17. NA
18. Discussed with Gerontology Advisory Council and Practicum agency partners
19. Used in hiring and FTEs increase proposals
20. Hired new tenure-track faculty
21. Encouraged faculty to submit abstracts and attend appropriate conferences
22. Included in printed and electronic materials for prospective and new students

Q5.3.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback**

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
----	----	----	----	----

from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?	Very Much	Quite a bit	Some	Not at All	N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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:

As recommended, we broke the PLO of focus down to its component parts and assessed these components separately to refine our understanding of students' strengths and areas of potential improvement.

To complement prior assessments based on self-reported data, this year we collected and analyzed external evaluation data about students' competencies and skills.

Re-evaluation of all PLOs, will be considered in the Program Assessment Process. Students were provided with performance definitions for the teamwork evaluation process along with class content and practice on evaluation self and others in the team. The worksheet and summary sheets were modified for F17-18 use.

(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:

NA

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:

NA

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?

Based on last year's feedback, we are reviewing the curriculum maps and assignments to identify places in the curriculum and coursework where we can help students develop their civic communication and more self reflection skills.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:



Appendix D CivicEngagement Rubric.docx
40.19 KB

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:

Attachment A - Civic Knowledge and Engagement Rubric and Standards of Performance/Expectations

Attachment B - Practicum Supervisor Evaluation of Student

Attachment C - Summary Data

Attachment D - Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric

Attachment E - Assessment Plan

Attachment F - Curriculum Map

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]

BS Gerontology

Q11.

Report Author(s):

Catheryn Koss, Cheryl Osborne

Q11.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Cheryl Osborne

Q11.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Catheryn Koss

Q12.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

Gerontology

Q13.

College:

College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

Q14.

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

Fact book not updated

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?

1

Q16.1. List all the names:

Gerontology

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

N/A

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

N/A

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

Q19.1. List all the names:

NA

When was your Assessment Plan...	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Before 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	No Plan	Don't know
Q20. Developed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q20.1. Last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20.2. (Required)

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

Appendix E Gerontology Assessment Plan Map -versions 2 17-2018.docx
 20.05 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**:

Appendix F Curriculum Map 17-2018.docx
 13.36 KB

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:

GERO 130 & GERO 131

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

Gerontology Department 2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report
Q2.3 Rubric and Standards of Performance/Expectations

Gerontology Department Performance Learning Objectives	Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric¹ Components and Capstone Achievement Definitions	Gerontology Competencies for Undergraduate and Graduate Education²	Standards of Performance Practicum Supervisor Evaluation of GERO 131 Students
4. Demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives when interacting with others and addressing elder needs. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 2, 3, 4, 5)	Diversity of Communities and Cultures Capstone achievement defined as: “Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others’ engagement with diversity.”	I.4 Relate social theories and science of aging to understanding heterogeneity, inequality and context of aging.	Ability to hear and consider viewpoints different from one’s own Ability to demonstrate respect for different cultures & languages Ability to maintain ethical practice: Respect
1. Demonstrate understanding of fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge, theories, skills, values, and current trends as a basis for competent gerontological practice. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 1, 2, 5)	Analysis of Knowledge Capstone achievement defined as: “Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one’s own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one’s own participation in civic life, politics, and government.”	III.8. Engage in research to advance knowledge and improve interventions for older persons.	Ability to evaluate, modify, and explain practice decisions Ability to conceptualize and to discern significance of interrelationships and to draw generalizations Ability to apply information from general to specific and from specific to general
5. Exhibit personal and social responsibility, (including life-long learning) and ethical and professional behavior in all settings. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 4,	Civic Identity and Commitment Capstone achievement defined as: “Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as	II.1. Develop a gerontological perspective through knowledge and self-reflection. II.2. Adhere to ethical	Ability and willingness to evaluate one’s own strengths and limitations Ability to maintain ethical practice: Giving and receiving critical feedback

¹ Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/VALUE/CivicEngagementSample.pdf>

² Association for Gerontology in Higher Education. (2014). *Gerontology Competencies for Undergraduate and Graduate Education*. Retrieved from https://www.aghe.org/images/aghe/competencies/gerontology_competencies.pdf

Gerontology Department Performance Learning Objectives	Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric ¹ Components and Capstone Achievement Definitions	Gerontology Competencies for Undergraduate and Graduate Education ²	Standards of Performance Practicum Supervisor Evaluation of GERO 131 Students
5)	it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.”	principles to guide work with and on behalf of older persons.	Ability to maintain ethical practice: Honest communication
6. Exhibit effective use of basic communication (written, oral and interpersonal) skills and information technology needed in a global information society. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 3, 4)	<p>Civic Communication</p> <p>Capstone achievement defined as: “Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action.”</p>	II.3. Engage, through effective communication older persons, their families and the community, in personal and public issues in aging.	<p>Ability to present self clearly</p> <p>Ability to make appropriate and focused responses</p> <p>Ability to present ideas verbally and in writing</p>
3. Synthesize and apply learned interdisciplinary theories and research in applied settings. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 1, 2, 3, 5)	<p>Civic Action and Reflection</p> <p>Capstone achievement defined as: “Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one’s actions.”</p>	III.3. Employ and design programmatic and community development with and on behalf of the aging population.	<p>Ability to assess one’s own impact on others</p> <p>Ability to take responsibility for one’s own decisions</p> <p>Ability for self direction and responsibility for own learning</p> <p>Ability and willingness to evaluate one’s own professional goals</p>
2. Demonstrate critical thinking when analyzing diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes for elders, families, and society from an interdisciplinary perspective that is grounded in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. (Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals 1, 2, 3, 5)	<p>Civic Contexts/Structures</p> <p>Capstone achievement defined as: “Demonstrates ability and commitment to <i>collaboratively work across and within</i> community contexts and structures <i>to achieve a civic aim.</i>”</p>	<p>II.4. Engage collaboratively with others to promote integrated approaches to aging.</p> <p>III.7 Employ and generate policy to equitably address the needs of older persons.</p>	<p>Ability to form and sustain collaborative relationships</p> <p>Ability to maintain ethical practice: Following organizational protocol and lines of communication</p> <p>Ability to differentiate personal and professional relationships</p>

Practicum Supervisor Evaluation of Student

GERO 131

Practicum Supervisor Name _____ Course _____

Agency _____ Semester/Date of Review _____

The abilities listed on this form have been identified as requisite for professional practice. Each field supervisor is asked to evaluate the professional preparation of the respective student. This evaluation is to be completed by the field supervisor and subsequently discussed with and signed by the student. It is to be given to the student and turned into the Gerontology Field Coordinator with the Course Portfolio at the end of the semester. This evaluation serves as one of the final evaluation tools. Ongoing evaluation and communication with student and faculty coordinator is expected, especially when the student is performing at less than beginning competency.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the following evaluation for (each) student.

Code: (1) Poor (2) Fair (3) Good (4) Excellent (5) Exemplary

Skill and Knowledge Competency Rating Scale:

1. Student has difficulty grasping concepts.
2. Student grasps idea, but does not demonstrate competency.
3. Student demonstrates beginning competency.
4. Student demonstrates competency but not consistency.
5. Student demonstrates competency coherently and consistently as an integrated part of the student's performance.

Behavior	Scoring					Examples
Ability to present self clearly	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to make appropriate and focused responses	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to differentiate personal and professional relationships	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to form and sustain collaborative relationships	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to assess one's own impact on others	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to take responsibility for one's own decisions	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to hear and consider viewpoints different from one's own	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to evaluate, modify, and explain practice decisions	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to conceptualize and to discern significance of interrelationships and to draw generalizations	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to apply information from general to specific and from specific to general	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to present ideas verbally and in writing	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability for self direction and responsibility for own learning	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability and willingness to evaluate one's own professional goals	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability and willingness to evaluate one's own strengths and limitations	1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to demonstrate respect for different cultures & languages	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Ability to maintain ethical practice:</i>						

Behavior	Scoring					Examples
Confidentiality	1	2	3	4	5	
Respect	1	2	3	4	5	
Honest communication	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance	1	2	3	4	5	
Timely completion of projects	1	2	3	4	5	
Following through on obligations and contracts	1	2	3	4	5	
Giving and receiving critical feedback	1	2	3	4	5	
Following organizational protocol and lines of communication	1	2	3	4	5	
Additional Remarks:						
Areas of Strength:						
Areas for Growth:						

Comments on Student's overall preparation or work in the field of Gerontology:

Practicum Supervisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Student's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Advisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Practicum Agency: _____

Please copy when complete:

Original Copy: Gerontology Department Director

1 Copy: Student

1 Copy: Supervisor

Gerontology Department 2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report Q4.1 Summary of Assessment Data, Findings, & Conclusions

The focused inquiry analyzed data for 55 students who completed GERO 131 in the Fall of 2017 or the Spring of 2018. These students completed their practicums at over 30 agencies across the Sacramento area. These practicum sites included state and federal government agencies, non-profit service providers and advocacy groups, health and long-term care providers, and research institutions.

Overall, practicum site supervisors rated the gerontology students high, with average scores ranging from 4.52 to 4.95. These high scores reflect the emphasis placed throughout the gerontology curriculum on civic engagement knowledge and skills. Scores were highest for the measures relating to *Diversity of Communities and Cultures*, to *Civic Identity and Commitment*, and to *Civic Contexts/Structures*.

Although still above four, the scores were relatively lower for the three competencies related to *Civic Communication*: “Ability to present self clearly” (4.52), “Ability to make appropriate and focused responses” (4.52), and “Ability to present ideas verbally and in writing” (4.56). These data indicate an area of potential improvement by further strengthening students’ abilities to present verbal and written information more clearly.

Another area for potential improvement that emerged was self-reflection, a performance measure that cut across multiple components of Civil Knowledge and Engagement. Again, while still high, the average scores for “Ability and willingness to evaluate one’s own strengths and limitations” (4.65) and “Ability to assess one’s own impact on others (4.54) were slightly lower than the other scores. These results suggest that students could be further supported and encouraged to engage in deeper self-reflection.

Measure	Mean
<i>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</i>	
Ability to hear and consider viewpoints different from one’s own	4.87
Ability to demonstrate respect for different cultures & languages	4.89
Ability to maintain ethical practice: Respect	4.95
Composite	4.90
<i>Analysis of Knowledge</i>	
Ability to evaluate, modify, and explain practice decisions	4.74
Ability to conceptualize and to discern significance of interrelationships and to draw generalizations	4.75
Ability to apply information from general to specific and from specific to general	4.76
Composite	4.75
<i>Civic Identity and Commitment</i>	
Ability and willingness to evaluate one’s own strengths and limitations	4.65
Ability to maintain ethical practice: Giving and receiving critical feedback	4.82
Ability to maintain ethical practice: Honest communication	4.93
Composite	4.80
<i>Civic Communication</i>	

Measure	Mean
Ability to present self clearly	4.52
Ability to make appropriate and focused responses	4.67
Ability to present ideas verbally and in writing	4.56
Composite	4.58
<i>Civic Action and Reflection</i>	
Ability to assess one's own impact on others	4.54
Ability to take responsibility for one's own decisions	4.84
Ability for self direction and responsibility for own learning	4.82
Ability and willingness to evaluate one's own professional goals	4.71
Composite	4.73
<i>Civic Contexts/Structures</i>	
Ability to form and sustain collaborative relationships	4.78
Ability to maintain ethical practice: Following organizational protocol and lines of communication	4.89
Ability to differentiate personal and professional relationships	4.80
Composite	4.82

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact valu@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Framing Language

Preparing graduates for their public lives as citizens, members of communities, and professionals in society has historically been a responsibility of higher education. Yet the outcome of a civic-minded graduate is a complex concept. Civic learning outcomes are framed by personal identity and commitments, disciplinary frameworks and traditions, pre-professional norms and practice, and the mission and values of colleges and universities. This rubric is designed to make the civic learning outcomes more explicit. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. For students this could include community-based learning through service-learning classes, community-based research, or service within the community. Multiple types of work samples or collections of work may be utilized to assess this, such as:

- The student creates and manages a service program that engages others (such as youth or members of a neighborhood) in learning about and taking action on an issue they care about. In the process, the student also teaches and models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.
- The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of public action. As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.
- The student works on and takes a leadership role in a complex campaign to bring about tangible changes in the public's awareness or education on a particular issue, or even a change in public policy. Through this process, the student demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.
- The student integrates their academic work with community engagement, producing a tangible product (piece of legislation or policy, a business, building or civic infrastructure, water quality or scientific assessment, needs survey, research paper, service program, or organization) that has engaged community constituents and responded to community needs and assets through the process.

In addition, the nature of this work lends itself to opening up the review process to include community constituents that may be a part of the work, such as teammates, colleagues, community/agency members, and those served or collaborating in the process.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Civic identity: When one sees her or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.
- Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.
- Communication skills: Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.
- Civic life: The public life of the citizen concerned with the affairs of the community and nation as contrasted with private or personal life, which is devoted to the pursuit of private and personal interests.
- Politics: A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize as individuals. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another.
- Government: "The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of conflicts." (Retrieved from the Center for Civic Engagement Web site, May 5, 2009.)
- Civic/community contexts: Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation) or defined by shared identity (i.e., African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may be defined by a variety of approaches intended to benefit a person, group, or community, including community service or volunteer work, academic work.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact valu@aacu.org



Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
Analysis of Knowledge	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
Civic Identity and Commitment	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.	Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.	Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.
Civic Communication	Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action	Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.
Civic Action and Reflection	Demonstrates independent experience and <i>shows initiative in team leadership</i> of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Demonstrates independent experience and <i>team leadership</i> of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Has clearly <i>participated</i> in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.	Has <i>experimented</i> with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.
Civic Contexts/Structures	Demonstrates ability and commitment to <i>collaboratively work across and within</i> community contexts and structures <i>to achieve a civic aim</i> .	Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively <i>within</i> community contexts and structures <i>to achieve a civic aim</i> .	Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to <i>participate in</i> civic contexts and structures.	Experiments with civic contexts and structures, <i>tries out a few to see what fits</i> .

Appendix __

Gerontology Assessment PlanReviewed and Revised June 2018 ~~~~ Program Review **Fall 2018 - Spring 2019**

Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals reflected in parenthesis at end of PLOs

PLO	Measure	Course &/or Program	Completed Date	Next Review Date
	<i>Written & Oral Communication</i>	All Core Courses	Prior to 2011	
1. Demonstrate understanding of fundamental interdisciplinary evidence-based knowledge, theories, skills, values, and current trends as a basis for competent gerontological practice. (1, 2, 5)	<i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 (Capstone) (Program)	F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16	
	<i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i>	GERO 122 (course & Program)	F15-S16 F16-S17	
	<i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 101, 103 (courses)	F16-17 F17-S18 —	F18-S19 F19-S20
2. Demonstrate critical thinking when analyzing diverse and complex aging issues and outcomes for elders, families, and society from an interdisciplinary perspective that is grounded in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. (1, 2, 3, 5)	<i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 Capstone (Program)	F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16	
	<i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i>	GERO 122 (course & Program)	F15-S16 F16-S17	
	<i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 130 & 131 (courses)	F17-S18 -----	F18-S19 S19-S20
3. Synthesize and apply learned interdisciplinary theories and research in applied settings. (1, 2, 3, 5)	<i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 Capstone (Program)	F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16	
	<i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i>	GERO 122 (course & Program)	F15-S16 F16-S17	
	<i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i>	GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 130 & 131 (courses)	F17-S18 -----	F18-S19 S19-S20

<p>4. Demonstrate social and cultural awareness, sensitivity, respect, and support of multiple perspectives when interacting with others and addressing elder needs. (2, 3, 4, 5)</p>	<p><i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i></p> <p><i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i></p> <p><i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i></p>	<p>GERO 131 Capstone (Program)</p> <p>GERO 122 (course & Program)</p> <p>GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 130 & 131 (courses)</p>	<p>F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16</p> <p>F15-S16 F16-S17</p> <p>F17-S18 -----</p>	<p>F18-S19 S19-S20</p>
<p>5. Exhibit personal and social responsibility, (including life-long learning) and ethical and professional behavior in all settings. (4, 5)</p>	<p><i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i></p> <p><i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i></p> <p><i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i></p>	<p>GERO 131 Capstone (Program)</p> <p>GERO 122 (course & Program)</p> <p>GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 130 & 131 (courses)</p>	<p>F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16</p> <p>F15-S16 F16-S17</p> <p>F17-S18 -----</p>	<p>F18-S19 S19-S20</p>
<p>6. Exhibit effective use of basic communication (written, oral and interpersonal) skills and information technology needed in a global information society. (3 & 4)</p>	<p><i>Integrative Learning Value Rubric</i></p> <p><i>TeamWork Value Rubric (Interdisciplinary)</i></p> <p><i>Civic Engagement Value Rubric</i></p>	<p>GERO 131 Capstone (Program)</p> <p>GERO 122 (course & Program)</p> <p>GERO 131 (Capstone) (course) GERO 130 & 131 (courses)</p>	<p>F12-S13 F13-S14 F14-S15 F15-S16</p> <p>F15-S16 F16-S17</p> <p>F17-S18 -----</p>	<p>F18-S19 S19-S20</p>

Appendix ____

Gerontology Curriculum Map –PLOs & BGLs – Spring 2018

PLO → Course ↓	PLO 1 Knowledge, Skills values (BLG = #1, 2, 5)	PLO 2 Critical Thinking (BLG = #1, 2, 3, 5)	PLO 3 Theory & Research (BLG = #1,2,3,5)	PLO 4 Social Cultural (BLG = #2, 3, 4, 5)	PLO 5 Personal & Social Responsibility (BLG = #4, 5)	PLO 6 Effective Communication Written, Oral, Interpersonal; Information technology (BLG = #3, 4)
MAJOR CORE						
GERO 101	I/D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 102	I/D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 103	I/D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 121	I/D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 122	I/D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 130	D	D	D	D	D	D
GERO 131	M	M	M	M	M	M
Research Course	D	D	D			D
MULTIDISCIPLINARY CORE						
ETHN 133	I/D	D		D	D	D
FACS 141	I/D	D			D	
PSCH 151	I/D	D	D			
RPTA 117	I/D	D	D			
SWRK 151	I/D	D		D	D	D

Key: Student Learning

Level I – Introduced (I)

Level II – Developed & Practiced (D)

Level III - Demonstrated at the Mastery Level appropriate for graduation (M)