Department Mission and Vision:

Mission:

The School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics contributes to student success and to the advancement of criminal justice and forensic science practice and policy by:

1. Providing students with the specialized knowledge and skills to become well informed and engaged justice professionals;
2. Creating significant learning experiences by integrating innovative science, technology, civic engagement, and service learning into courses;
3. Creating partnerships to conduct applied research to improve policy and practice; and,
4. Promoting social justice, public awareness, scientific investigation in application to the law, and continuing education related to justice issues.

Student success = students who (1) have critical thinking skills; (2) communicate effectively; (3) are responsible; (4) are empathic; (5) understand the impact of micro and macro forces on justice policy and practice; and (6) acquire specialized scientific mastery of the principles, theories, and application of forensic science concepts.

Vision Statement:

The School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics at California State University, Los Angeles will be recognized both locally and nationwide for its accomplishments in the integration of teaching, research and community engagement.
**Please list all Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To acquire specialized knowledge and understanding of scientific concepts, theories, and principles in relation to the practice of criminal/juvenile justice systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To understand and connect the underlying theoretical, ethical, legal, scientific and social issues that influence and impact the practice of criminal/juvenile justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To analyze the issues relevant to criminal/juvenile justice and apply creative responses to them through practice, policy, and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To recognize and evaluate the interconnectedness between knowledge, diverse perspectives, and practice within the criminal/juvenile justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To create innovative responses to criminal justice research, policy, and practice needs through the application of knowledge and the principles of social science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alignment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (see Appendix A for a complete description of each ILO) - Please indicate which of your PLOs best match the following ILOs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO(s) which match this ILO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry</td>
<td>PLO 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency: Intellectual skills</td>
<td>PLO 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place and Community: Urban and global mission</td>
<td>PLO 3, 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation: Integrative learning</td>
<td>PLO 3, 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Results - Describe any assessment activities conducted within the past 2 academic years for each outcome. See Appendix for examples of assessment measures and use of results. Please attach any additional information as needed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome (List activities for each PLO. Enter “general” for activities that pertain to multiple PLOs)</th>
<th>1. How and when was this PLO assessed? (For example, which assessments were used, which courses were examined, what were the dates of data collection?) See Appendix B for other examples</th>
<th>2. What were the results? (For example, how many students reached each level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?) See Appendix C for other examples</th>
<th>3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1:</td>
<td>1. Has not been assessed in last two years.</td>
<td>2. NA</td>
<td>3. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLO 2:

1. Has not been assessed in last two years.
2. NA
3. NA

PLO 3:

1. This PLO was assessed in Fall 2016: A rubric was created for this PLO and the following undergraduate courses were assessed using this rubric (see attachment for rubric).
   - CRIM 4920 (2 sections): This course is the Criminal Justice Capstone course and is designed to integrate issues and materials from throughout the undergraduate curriculum. The course map indicates CRIM 4920 students should achieve PLO #3 at a D (Developed level). Instructors in both sections of this course used performance on a final paper to measure PLO #3.
   - CRIM 4930 (1 section): CRIM 4930 is our service learning course and the section that was assessed is Probation Service Learning section. The course map indicates CRIM 4930 students should achieve a P (Practiced) or higher in CRIM 4930.

2. Results:
   - CRIM 4920: 61% of students reached the Developed level or higher in one section and 47% reached this level in the other section.
   - CRIM 4930: 100% of students reached the Practiced level or higher.

3. Curricular improvements:
   - Because this assessment was just completed last semester, instructors are still developing ways to implement curricular changes to improve student learning.

PLO 4:

1. Has not been assessed in last two years.
2. NA
3. NA

PLO 5:

1. Has not been assessed in last two years.
2. NA
3. NA
Assessment Plan - In this section, provide a description of assessment plan that specifies assessment activities conducted (and to be conducted) from 2015-2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Academic year/semester when PLO is assessed</th>
<th>What is your tentative plan for assessing this PLO? (For example, which assessments will be used, which courses will examined?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Create rubric for PLO 1, assess for a random sample of courses. Each instructor has flexibility as to how they measure the extent to which students meet this PLO according to rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>Create rubric for PLO 2, assess for a random sample of courses. Each instructor has flexibility as to how they measure the extent to which students meet this PLO according to rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fall 2019 (was assessed in Fall 2016)</td>
<td>Assess for a random sample of courses. Each instructor has flexibility as to how they measure the extent to which students meet this PLO according to rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Create rubric for PLO 4, assess for a random sample of courses. Each instructor has flexibility as to how they measure the extent to which students meet this PLO according to rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>Create rubric for PLO 5, assess for a random sample of courses. Each instructor has flexibility as to how they measure the extent to which students meet this PLO according to rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With whom do you share your assessment information? (Please check all that apply)

- [x] faculty in the department
- [ ] students in the program
- [ ] campus administrators
- [ ] department alumni
- [ ] employers
- [ ] external community members
- [ ] Other (please specify) ________________________________

CRIM 5110 (1 section): CRIM 5110 is the graduate level Criminal Justice Research Methods course. The course map shows that students should achieve PLO #3 at the M (or Mastered) level.

CRIM 5110: 0% of students reached the Mastered level.
Append A: Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes and Goals

**Institutional Learning Goals**

https://spcc.calstatela.edu/

California State University, Los Angeles students expand and deepen their interdisciplinary and general understanding of the world, enhance their critical skills, and take responsibility for a lifetime of learning, and as graduates become individuals who engage, enhance, and contribute to democratic society.

**Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry**

CSULA graduates have a strong knowledge base in their academic major and can use powerful processes of inquiry in a range of disciplines. They engage contemporary and enduring questions with an understanding of the complexities of human cultures and the physical and natural world and are ready to put their knowledge into action to address contemporary issues.

**Proficiency: Intellectual skills**

CSULA graduates are equipped to actively participate in democratic society. They are critical thinkers who make use of quantitative and qualitative reasoning. They have the ability to find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making. They read critically, speak and write clearly and thoughtfully and communicate effectively.

**Place and Community: Urban and global mission**

CSULA graduates are engaged individuals who have contributed to the multi-lingual and multiethnic communities that constitute Los Angeles and the world of the future. They are aware of how their actions impact society and the environment, and they strive to make socially responsible decisions. They are community builders sensitive to the needs of diverse individuals and groups and committed to renewing the communities in which they live.

**Transformation: Integrative learning** CSULA graduates integrate academic learning with life. They engage in community, professional, creative, research and scholarly projects that lead to changes in their sense of self and understanding of their worlds. Graduates integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex and contemporary issues and act ethically as leaders for the 21st century.

Endorsed by Academic Senate 6/1/10 and approved by the President 6/8/10
Appendix B: Examples of Assessment Measures

The following are common measures used to assess program learning outcomes:
  - Capstone course
  - Project
  - Embedded questions
  - Public performance/exhibit
  - Portfolio review
  - Student survey
  - Alumni survey
  - Employer survey
  - Licensure exam
  - Student focus groups
  - Observation
  - Student interviews
  - Case study
  - Placement rates
  - Graduate level thesis
  - Graduate level process
  - Exit interviews
  - Comprehensive exam
  - Peer assessment of student work
  - Internship review
  - Advisory board feedback

Appendix C: Examples of Use of Assessments Results

The following are examples of the use of assessment results:
  - Improving department assessment process/methods
  - Curriculum improvement
  - Improving instruction
  - Examining curriculum content coverage
  - Examining skill development in curriculum
  - Introducing new pedagogies
  - Stimulating faculty discussion on student learning
  - Re-examining student learning outcomes
  - Engaging students in their own learning
PLO 3 (Application) Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Practiced</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Mastered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 3: Application:</strong></td>
<td>To analyze the issues relevant to criminal/juvenile justice and apply creative responses to them through practice, policy, and research.</td>
<td>Analyzed a CJ/JJ issue and/or attempted (successfully or not) to apply a response to the issue.</td>
<td>Demonstrated the ability to critically analyze a CJ/JJ issue and showed some level of ability (either basic or skillful) to apply a response to the issue(s).</td>
<td>Clearly demonstrated the ability to critically and effectively analyze relevant CJ/JJ issues and the skillful ability to apply creative response(s) to the relevant issue(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Mission:
To graduate well educated computer scientists who are prepared to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing, increasingly complex world. This will be accomplished through:

- A well-qualified faculty who care about students and their success.
- A dynamic, up-to-date curriculum that has an optimal balance between theory and practice.
- Laboratories, computer facilities, and instructional classrooms on par with any computer science program in the nation.
- Unique co-curricular opportunities for students such as participation in student design competitions, professional student organizations, and pre-professional employment.
- Opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to participate in research and industry-funded design clinic projects.
- Mutually beneficial partnerships with area industry that take advantage of our location in one of the most concentrated high-tech centers in the nation.
- Strong cooperative relationships with local high schools, community colleges, and with other four-year institutions.

Please list all Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

1. Students will be able to apply concepts and techniques from computing and mathematics to both theoretical and practical problems.
2. Students will be able to demonstrate fluency in at least one programming language and acquaintance with at least three more.
3. Students will have a strong foundation in the design, analysis, and application of many types of algorithms.
4. Students will have a fundamental understanding of computer systems.
5. Students will have the training to analyze problems and identify and define the computing requirements appropriate to their solutions.
6. Students will have the training to design, implement, and evaluate large software systems working both individually and collaboratively.
7. Students will be able to communicate effectively orally and in writing.
8. Students will have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for lifelong self-development.
9. Students will have the ability to analyze the local and global impact of computing on individuals and society.
10. Students will have a fundamental understanding of social, professional, ethical, legal, and security issues in computing.

Alignment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (see Appendix A for a complete description of each ILO) - Please indicate which of your PLOs best match the following ILOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO(s) which match this ILO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proficiency: Intellectual skills</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Place and Community: Urban and global mission</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transformation: Integrative learning</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Results - Describe any assessment activities conducted within the past 2 academic years for each outcome. See Appendix for examples of assessment measures and use of results. Please attach any additional information as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome (List activities for each PLO. Enter “general” for activities that pertain to multiple PLOs)</th>
<th>1. How and when was this PLO assessed? (For example, which assessments were used, which courses were examined, what were the dates of data collection?) See Appendix B for other examples</th>
<th>2. What were the results? (For example, how many students reached each level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?) See Appendix C for other examples</th>
<th>3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (All ten PLO’s)</td>
<td>• The PLO’s are evaluated every year for its “satisfaction” and periodically (3 to 5 years) for its “importance”. 2016 is the most recent assessment cycle that also involved the Quarter to Semester Conversion. • The main assessment measures are: a. Rubric evaluations in targeted courses. b. External exam - Major Field Test (MFT) conducted by Educational Testing Services.</td>
<td>• The responses to the “importance and “satisfaction” of PLO’s from all constituent surveys are satisfactory (exceeds 3 on a 5 point scale). • The following list of activities were identified: a. Expand Senior Design sequence to 3 quarters from 2 quarters. b. Coordinate MATH248 and CS3112 as a sequence c. Integrate assessment</td>
<td>• CS491AB was expanded to CS496ABC • Extended project-based learning to multiple lower/upper division courses that is similar to the CS201-CS203 sequence. • CS301 was enhanced to cover broader ethical and societal issues with issues specific to Computer Science to meet ABET criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CS491AB was expanded to CS496ABC
- Extended project-based learning to multiple lower/upper division courses that is similar to the CS201-CS203 sequence.
- CS301 was enhanced to cover broader ethical and societal issues with issues specific to Computer Science to meet ABET criteria.
c. Various constituent (Alumni, Faculty, IAB, Student) surveys.


e. Industry Advisory Board Annual Meeting (Spring 2015 & Spring 2016)

(For more details, see table below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO#</th>
<th>Course/Measure</th>
<th>Who/Where Data is collected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. CS490 Assessment Indicator #1</td>
<td>Instructor conducts assignments and exams. They are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. MFT Assessment Indicator #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. SLO-1 Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. CS490 Assessment Indicator #2</td>
<td>Instructor conducts assignments and exams. They are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. MFT Assessment Indicator #1</td>
<td>Assessment Indicator AI-1 on MFT provides the national percentile the institution is in based on the mean score of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. SLO-2 Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. CS490 Assessment Indicator #3</td>
<td>Instructor conducts assignments and exams. They are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. MFT Assessment Indicator #2</td>
<td>Assessment Indicator AI-2 on MFT provides the national percentile the institution is in based on the mean score of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SLO-3 Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4                          | 1. CS490 Assessment Indicator #4  
2. MFT Assessment Indicator #3  
3. SLO-4 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor conducts assignments and exams. They are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric K)  
Assessment Indicator AI-3 on MFT provides the national percentile the institution is in based on the mean score of the students.  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
| 5                          | 1. CS337/496A Requirements  
2. SLO-5 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor – Rubric R evaluations  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
| 6                          | 1. CS437/496ABC Design  
2. CS437/496C Team Implementation  
3. CS337/496A/CS496C Team Work  
4. SLO-6 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor - Rubric D evaluations  
Instructor - rubric evaluations (Rubric I)  
Instructor – rubric evaluations (Rubric T)  
Student – rubric evaluations (Rubric T)  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
| 7                          | 1. CS337/496A/496C Oral  
2. CS496A/496C Written  
3. SLO-6 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor– rubric evaluations (Rubric O)  
Instructor – rubric evaluations (Rubric W)  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
| 8                          | 1. CS301/496C Life Long Learning  
2. SLO-8 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor – rubric evaluations (Rubric L) per student  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
| 9                          | 1. CS301 Computing  
2. SLO-9 Satisfaction Survey | Instructor conducts assignments, exams and presentations. The scores are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric E)  
Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period. |
Instructor conducts assignments, exams, and presentations. The scores are added and normalized on a 5 point scale for each student. (Rubric E)

Constituent surveys for this SLO. The survey is collected every year over the 2 year period.
Append A: Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes and Goals

**Institutional Learning Goals**

[https://spcc.calstatela.edu/](https://spcc.calstatela.edu/)

California State University, Los Angeles students expand and deepen their interdisciplinary and general understanding of the world, enhance their critical skills, and take responsibility for a lifetime of learning, and as graduates become individuals who engage, enhance, and contribute to democratic society.

**Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry**

CSULA graduates have a strong knowledge base in their academic major and can use powerful processes of inquiry in a range of disciplines. They engage contemporary and enduring questions with an understanding of the complexities of human cultures and the physical and natural world and are ready to put their knowledge into action to address contemporary issues.

**Proficiency: Intellectual skills**

CSULA graduates are equipped to actively participate in democratic society. They are critical thinkers who make use of quantitative and qualitative reasoning. They have the ability to find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making. They read critically, speak and write clearly and thoughtfully and communicate effectively.

**Place and Community: Urban and global mission**

CSULA graduates are engaged individuals who have contributed to the multi-lingual and multiethnic communities that constitute Los Angeles and the world of the future. They are aware of how their actions impact society and the environment, and they strive to make socially responsible decisions. They are community builders sensitive to the needs of diverse individuals and groups and committed to renewing the communities in which they live.

**Transformation: Integrative learning**

CSULA graduates integrate academic learning with life. They engage in community, professional, creative, research and scholarly projects that lead to changes in their sense of self and understanding of their worlds. Graduates integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex and contemporary issues and act ethically as leaders for the 21st century.

Endorsed by Academic Senate 6/1/10 and approved by the President 6/8/10
Appendix B: Examples of Assessment Measures

The following are common measures used to assess program learning outcomes:

- Capstone course
- Project
- Embedded questions
- Public performance/exhibit
- Portfolio review
- Student survey
- Alumni survey
- Employer survey
- Licensure exam
- Student focus groups
- Observation
- Student interviews
- Case study
- Placement rates
- Graduate level thesis
- Graduate level process
- Exit interviews
- Comprehensive exam
- Peer assessment of student work
- Internship review
- Advisory board feedback

Appendix C: Examples of Use of Assessments Results

The following are examples of the use of assessment results:

- Improving department assessment process/methods
- Curriculum improvement
- Improving instruction
- Examining curriculum content coverage
- Examining skill development in curriculum
- Introducing new pedagogies
- Stimulating faculty discussion on student learning
- Re-examining student learning outcomes
- Engaging students in their own learning
Department Mission:

The CCOE mission is to develop in CCOE students the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote the academic, social, and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools and related agencies. CCOE graduates become teachers, special educators, school administrators, educational technologists, researchers, program evaluators, school psychologists, counselors, rehabilitation professionals, higher education faculty, and other educational specialists. Within an environment of shared governance, CCOE professional preparation programs utilize data-driven decision-making, technology-integrated instruction, meaningful curricula, and outcome-based assessments to ensure high-quality educational opportunities for all CCOE students.

Please list all Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

1. Students produce written summaries, reflections, literature reviews, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that demonstrate understandings of bodies of knowledge constitutive of the field of Educational Foundations.

2. Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop an Interpreive Perspective on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

3. Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop a Normative Perspective on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

4. Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop a Critical Perspective on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

5. Students apply knowledge and skills in the design, methods, and analysis of quantitative research in education.
6. Students apply knowledge and skills in the design, methods, and analysis of qualitative research in education.

Alignment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (see Appendix A for a complete description of each ILO) - Please indicate which of your PLOs best match the following ILOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO(s) which match this ILO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry</td>
<td>PLO #1, PLO #2, PLO #3, and PLO #4, PLO #5, and PLO #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proficiency: Intellectual skills</td>
<td>PLO #1, PLO #2, PLO #3, PLO #4, PLO #5, and PLO #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Place and Community: Urban and global mission</td>
<td>PLO #1, PLO #2, PLO #3, and PLO #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transformation: Integrative learning</td>
<td>PLO #1, PLO #2, PLO #3, and PLO #4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Results - Describe any assessment activities conducted within the past 2 academic years for each outcome. See Appendix for examples of assessment measures and use of results. Please attach any additional information as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome (List activities for each PLO. Enter “general” for activities that pertain to multiple PLOs)</th>
<th>1. How and when was this PLO assessed? (For example, which assessments were used, which courses were examined, what were the dates of data collection?) See Appendix B for other examples</th>
<th>2. What were the results? (For example, how many students reached each level of proficiency on the SLOs assessed?) See Appendix C for other examples</th>
<th>3. Based on the results, what instructional, programmatic, or curricular improvements were made?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General: Program PLOs.</td>
<td>Educational Foundations (EDFN) faculty met in the spring of 2016 to discuss the potential impact of the upcoming semester conversion for the 2016-2017 academic year, the effective integration of new faculty, and a redesign of the program, its PLOs, and the assessment of PLOs.</td>
<td>➔ ➔ ➔ ➔</td>
<td>EDFN faculty decided the following: to limit the courses in which existing PLOs would be assessed (to EDFN 5070, EDFN 5060, and EDFN 5300); to continue using the Comprehensive Examination as a major and culminating assessment of existing PLOs; to deliver instruction in new courses (EDFN 5090) and converted courses (EDFN 5090 and EDFN 5250) to be taught by new faculty during the 2016-2017 academic year while focusing on these toward a redesign of the Program and its PLOs (to be undertaken after the first year of semester conversion); to monitor the effects/needs of student enrollment on EDFN semester scheduling and the implication of these for a redesign of the Program, its PLOs, and the...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. PLO # 1: Students produce written summaries, reflections, literature reviews, research papers, and/or class presentations that demonstrate understandings of bodies of knowledge constitutive of the field of Educational Foundations.

Throughout the 2015-2016 AY, PLO#1 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers for EDFN 507, EDFN 506, EDFN 525, EDFN 530, and EDFN 550; and, Throughout the 2016-2017 AY, PLO#2 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers, for EDFN 5070, EDFN 5060, and EDFN 5300.

Extensive written feedback (including recommendations for increasing development when needed) on student performance regarding PLO#1 was provided to every student by the instructor on all Writing Assignments and the Final Paper. Systematic quantification of individual students’ achieved levels of proficiency with regard to PLO#1 was not undertaken.

Upon completed assessment of Writing Assignments, overall student performance regarding PLO#1 was discussed in class and specific issues with students’ evidenced understanding of bodies of knowledge in the field or the effective written articulation of their development were addressed.

Students whose Writing Assignment evidenced a still-developing level of understanding of bodies of knowledge in the field were required to meet with the instructor for one-to-one feedback aimed at increasing development.

Specific students were advised/required to redo and resubmit Writing Assignments or parts thereof.

No programmatic, instructional, or curricular improvements were made as a result of this assessment of PLO#1.

PLO#1 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016 and the spring of 2017.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016, 14 students completed the exam and 1 student withdrew before completing the exam. Of the 14 students who completed the exam, 10 students (71%) evidenced a highly developed level of understanding of bodies of knowledge in the field, and 4 students (29%) evidenced a developed level. 0 (0%) of students evidenced a still-developing level of understanding.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2017, 10 students completed the exam and 1 student withdrew before completing the exam. Of the 10 students who completed the exam, 8 students (80%) evidenced...
3. **PLO #2**: Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop an Interpretive Perspective on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

Throughout the 2015-2016 AY, PLO#2 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers, for EDFN 507, EDFN 506, EDFN 525, EDFN 530, and EDFN 550; and, throughout the 2016-2017 AY, PLO#2 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers for EDFN 5070, EDFN 5060, and EDFN 5300.

Extensive written feedback (including recommendations for increasing development when needed) on student performance regarding PLO#2 was provided to every student by the course instructor on all Writing Assignments and the Final Paper. Systematic quantification of students’ individual achieved levels of proficiency with regard to PLO#2 was not undertaken.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016, 5 of 10 of students (35.7%) completing the exam evidenced a highly developed ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field to develop an Interpretive Perspective on urban schooling, 7 of 14 students (50%) evidenced a developed ability, and 2 of 14 students (14.3%) evidenced a still-developing ability.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2017, 4 of 10 students (40%) completing the exam evidenced a highly developed ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field to develop an Interpretive Perspective on urban schooling. No major programmatic, instructional, or curricular improvements were made as a result of this assessment of PLO#2.

Students evidencing a highly developed level of understanding of bodies of knowledge in the field, and 2 students (20%) evidenced a developed level.

Students evidencing a still-developing level of ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research in the field to develop an Interpretive Perspective on urban schooling were required to meet with the instructor for one-to-one feedback aimed at increasing development.

Students whose Writing Assignments evidenced a still-developing level of performance regarding PLO#2 were advised/required to redo and resubmit the written articulation of their interpretive perspective on urban schooling.
4. **PLO #3**: Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop a **Normative Perspective** on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

Throughout the 2015-2016 AY, PLO#3 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers, for EDFN 507, EDFN 506, EDFN 525, EDFN 530, and EDFN 550; and, throughout the 2016-2017 AY, PLO#3 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers for EDFN 5070, EDFN 5060, and EDFN 5300.

Extensive written feedback (including recommendations for increasing development when needed) on student performance regarding PLO#3 was provided to every student by the course instructor on all Writing Assignments and the Final Paper.

Students whose Writing Assignments evidenced a **still-developing** level of ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research in the field to develop a **Normative Perspective** on urban schooling were required to meet with the instructor for one-to-one feedback aimed at increasing development.

Students evidencing a **still-developing** level of performance regarding PLO#3 were advised/required to redo and resubmit the written articulation of their **Normative Perspective** on urban schooling.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016, 8 of 14 (57%) students completing the exam evidenced a **highly developed** ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field to develop a **Normative Perspective** on urban schooling. 5 of 14 (36%) students evidenced a **developed** ability, and 1 of 14 students (7%) evidenced a **still-developing** ability.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2017, 9 of 10 (90%) students completing the exam evidenced a **highly developed** ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research to develop a **Normative Perspective** on urban schooling. 1 of 10 students (10%) evidenced a **developed** ability, and 0 students (0%) evidenced a **still-developing** ability.

No major programmatic, instructional, or curricular improvements were made as a result of this assessment of PLO#3.

PLO#3 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016 and the spring of 2017.
5. **PLO # 4**: Students produce written reflections, research papers, analytical papers, and/or class presentations that employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field of Educational Foundations to develop a **Critical Perspective** on urban schooling and/or issues of educational equity in urban schooling.

Throughout the 2015-2016 AY, PLO#4 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers, for EDFN 507, EDFN 506, EDFN 525, EDFN 530, and EDFN 550; and, throughout the 2016-2017 AY, PLO#4 was assessed through Writing Assignments, Class Presentations, and Final Papers for EDFN 5070, EDFN 5060, and EDFN 5300.

PLO#4 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016 and the spring of 2017.

Extensive written feedback (including recommendations for increasing development when needed) on student performance regarding PLO#4 was provided to every student by the course instructor on all Writing Assignments and the Final Paper.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2016, 7 of 14 (50%) students completing the exam evidenced a **highly developed** ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research findings in the field to develop a **Critical Perspective** on urban schooling, 6 of 14 (43%) students evidenced a **developed** ability, and 1 of 14 students (7%) evidenced a **still-developing** ability.

In the Comprehensive Examination administered in the spring of 2017, 9 of 10 (90%) students completing the exam evidenced a **highly developed** ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research to develop a **Critical Perspective** on urban schooling, 1 of 10 students (10%) evidenced a **developed** ability, and 0 students (0%) evidenced a **still-developing** ability.

Students whose Writing Assignments evidenced a **still-developing** level of ability to employ understandings of major theories, concepts, ideas, and/or research in the field to develop a **Critical Perspective** on urban schooling were required to meet with the instructor for one-to-one feedback aimed at increasing development.

Students evidencing a **still-developing** level of performance regarding PLO#3 were advised/required to redo and resubmit the written articulation of their **Critical Perspective** on urban schooling.

No major programmatic, instructional, or curricular improvements were made as a result of this assessment of PLO#3.
Assessment Plan - In this section, provide a description of assessment plan that specifies assessment activities conducted (and to be conducted) from 2015-2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Academic year/semester when PLO is assessed</th>
<th>What is your tentative plan for assessing this PLO? (For example, which assessments will be used, which courses will be examined?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. PLO # 1               | Fall Quarter 2015  
Winter Quarter 2016  
Spring Quarter 2016  
Fall Semester 2016  
Spring Semester 2017  
Fall Semester 2017 – TBD*  
Spring Semester 2018 – TBD*  
Fall Semester 2018 – TBD*  
Spring Semester 2019 – TBD* | Fall Quarter 2015: PLO#1 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 507 and EDFN 530.  
Winter Quarter 2016: PLO#1 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 506 and EDFN 550.  
Spring Quarter 2016: PLO#1 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 525. PLO#1 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination.  
Fall Semester 2016: PLO#1 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 5070 and EDFN 5030.  
Spring Semester 2017: PLO#1 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 5060.  
Fall Semester 2017: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2018: TBD*  
Fall Semester 2018: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2019: TBD* |
| 2. PLO # 2               | Fall Quarter 2015  
Winter Quarter 2016  
Spring Quarter 2016  
Fall Semester 2016  
Spring Semester 2017  
Fall Semester 2017  
Spring Semester 2018  
Fall Semester 2018  
Spring Semester 2019 | Fall Quarter 2015: PLO#2 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 507 and EDFN 530.  
Winter Quarter 2016: PLO#2 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 506 and EDFN 550.  
Spring Quarter 2016: PLO#2 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 525. PLO#1 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination.  
Fall Semester 2016: PLO#2 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 5070 and EDFN 5030.  
Spring Semester 2017: PLO#2 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 5060.  
Fall Semester 2017: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2018: TBD*  
Fall Semester 2018: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2019: TBD* |
| 3. PLO # 3 | Fall Quarter 2015  
Winter Quarter 2016  
Spring Quarter 2016  
Fall Semester 2016  
Spring Semester 2017  
Fall Semester 2017  
Spring Semester 2018  
Fall Semester 2018  
Spring Semester 2019 | Fall Quarter 2015: PLO#3 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 507 and EDFN 530.  
Winter Quarter 2016: PLO#3 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 506 and EDFN 550.  
Spring Quarter 2016: PLO#3 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 525. PLO#1 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination.  
Fall Semester 2016: PLO#3 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 5070 and EDFN 5030.  
Spring Semester 2017: PLO#3 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 5060.  
Fall Semester 2017: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2018: TBD*  
Fall Semester 2018: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2019: TBD* |
|---|---|
| 4. PLO # 4 | Fall Quarter 2015  
Winter Quarter 2016  
Spring Quarter 2016  
Fall Semester 2016  
Spring Semester 2017  
Fall Semester 2017  
Spring Semester 2018  
Fall Semester 2018  
Spring Semester 2019 | Fall Quarter 2015: PLO#4 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 507 and EDFN 530.  
Winter Quarter 2016: PLO#4 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 506 and EDFN 550.  
Spring Quarter 2016: PLO#4 was assessed through 4 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 525. PLO#1 was also assessed through the Comprehensive Examination.  
Fall Semester 2016: PLO#4 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation, and a Final Paper in EDFN 5070 and EDFN 5030.  
Spring Semester 2017: PLO#4 was assessed through 3 Writing Assignments, a Class Presentation and a Final Paper in EDFN 5060.  
Fall Semester 2017: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2018: TBD*  
Fall Semester 2018: TBD*  
Spring Semester 2019: TBD* |
* EDFN faculty will be meeting in the summer of 2017 to discuss redesigning the Program, its PLOs, and the assessment of PLOs to account for the inclusion of two new tenure-track faculty (who are only jointly appointed to EDFN) and the exigencies/limitations of semester scheduling and faculty course load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With whom do you share your assessment information? (Please check all that apply)**

- [x] faculty in the department  
- [x] students in the program  
- [ ] campus administrators  
- [ ] department alumni  
- [ ] employers  
- [x] external community members  
- [ ] Other (please specify) ________________________________________________________
Append A: Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes and Goals

Institutional Learning Goals

https://spcc.calstatela.edu/

California State University, Los Angeles students expand and deepen their interdisciplinary and general understanding of the world, enhance their critical skills, and take responsibility for a lifetime of learning, and as graduates become individuals who engage, enhance, and contribute to democratic society.

Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry

CSULA graduates have a strong knowledge base in their academic major and can use powerful processes of inquiry in a range of disciplines. They engage contemporary and enduring questions with an understanding of the complexities of human cultures and the physical and natural world and are ready to put their knowledge into action to address contemporary issues.

Proficiency: Intellectual skills

CSULA graduates are equipped to actively participate in democratic society. They are critical thinkers who make use of quantitative and qualitative reasoning. They have the ability to find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making. They read critically, speak and write clearly and thoughtfully and communicate effectively.

Place and Community: Urban and global mission

CSULA graduates are engaged individuals who have contributed to the multi-lingual and multiethnic communities that constitute Los Angeles and the world of the future. They are aware of how their actions impact society and the environment, and they strive to make socially responsible decisions. They are community builders sensitive to the needs of diverse individuals and groups and committed to renewing the communities in which they live.

Transformation: Integrative learning

CSULA graduates integrate academic learning with life. They engage in community, professional, creative, research and scholarly projects that lead to changes in their sense of self and understanding of their worlds. Graduates integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex and contemporary issues and act ethically as leaders for the 21st century.
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Appendix B: Examples of Assessment Measures

The following are common measures used to assess program learning outcomes:
- Capstone course
- Project
- Embedded questions
- Public performance/exhibit
- Portfolio review
- Student survey
- Alumni survey
- Employer survey
- Licensure exam
- Student focus groups
- Observation
- Student interviews
- Case study
- Placement rates
- Graduate level thesis
- Graduate level process
- Exit interviews
- Comprehensive exam
- Peer assessment of student work
- Internship review
- Advisory board feedback

Appendix C: Examples of Use of Assessments Results

The following are examples of the use of assessment results:
- Improving department assessment process/methods
- Curriculum improvement
- Improving instruction
- Examining curriculum content coverage
- Examining skill development in curriculum
- Introducing new pedagogies
- Stimulating faculty discussion on student learning
- Re-examining student learning outcomes
- Engaging students in their own learning