PROGRAM: _____ **COLLEGE/SCHOOL:** _____

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR OR CHAIR: _____

COLLEGE ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR AND EMAIL: _____

Feedback Form and Purpose:

In an effort to encourage continuous program improvement, the Director of Assessment and College Assessment Coordinators (CACs) have developed this feedback form. Annual Assessment Reports provided by the programs in 2016-2017 have been scored by the College Assessment Coordinators. You will find the results for your program and recommendations for areas of improvement below.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
PLOs	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., **very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, and disorganized.** List **does not align with relevant institution-wide learning outcomes** (see below). The list may **confuse learning processes** (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).	The **list includes reasonable outcomes** but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. **Some institution-wide learning outcomes and/or core competencies are missing.** Distinctions between expectations for **undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear**.	The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes **relevant institution-wide outcomes** and core competencies. Outcomes are **appropriate for the level** (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, measureable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with **clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate** expectations. All **relevant institution-wide outcomes** and core competencies are explicitly articulated.

Recommendations for this program:

Initial & Emerging

- Since your PLOs are at the initial or emerging stage, we encourage you to send 2 faculty members to attend the **"Building Better Learning Outcomes"** workshop on Monday, Nov. 6 from 10-12 in the Library Community Room (Lib North B131). To RSVP use this link:

- You have the same PLOs for undergraduate and graduate outcomes, and we encourage you to differentiate expectations for undergraduate and graduate students by developing separate outcomes for each.
- You could reduce the number of PLOs to 5-10 outcomes by combining similar outcomes or reducing redundancy.
- You could revise your PLOs to improve the word choice and employ more measureable, specific verbs.
- The following institutional learning outcomes or core competencies are not clearly articulated in your PLOs: (SPECIFY). You could revise your PLOs to include these outcomes or competencies (see Appendix B for more information).

Developed & Well-Developed

- You could revise your PLOs to improve the word choice and employ more measureable, specific verbs.
- The following institutional learning outcomes or core competencies are not clearly articulated in your PLOs: (SPECIFY). You could revise your PLOs to include these outcomes or competencies (see Appendix B for more information).

Assessment Evidence:

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Collection and Use of Assessment Evidence	**No direct methods** are used (only indirect methods described). The **description of the assessment method is vague and/or insufficient**; more information is needed to understand how it will measure student outcomes on the PLO(s). Program mainly uses **course grades or pass-rates** as an	Capstone projects, theses, or classroom based assignments are used by faculty to assess outcomes, **but faculty need to systematically examine and share results** at the program level. At least **one type of program-level assessment** has been conducted (e.g., program-wide evaluation of capstone projects or indirect assessments such as student surveys, etc.), but faculty have not yet **systematically**	**Direct evidence for more than one learning outcome** has been collected, analyzed, and discussed by faculty to improve the program. **One assessment which examines multiple learning outcomes** has been collected, analyzed, and discussed by faculty to improve the program. Follow-up studies have not been conducted. Methods may not assess achievement of outcomes at **program exit**.	**Multiple types of program-level direct evidence** are collected to examine student learning. **Data is regularly used** to plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. Outcomes are assessed on a **regular cycle and/or follow-up studies** are utilized.

	assessment method.	**examined, shared, and/or used results** to improve the program.		

Recommendations for this program:

Initial & Emerging

- Since your assessment results at the initial or emerging stage, we encourage you to send 2 faculty members to attend the **"Assessment in 5 Easy Steps"** workshop on Monday, Nov. 20 from 10-12 in the Library Community Room (Lib North B131). To RSVP use this link: http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/rsvp-assessment-5-easy-steps-workshop
- Encourage faculty to share results from course-level assessments with program faculty.
- Pick at least 1 program learning outcome that is a priority. Develop a plan to collect assessment data this year (see Appendix C for examples).
- Volunteer for institutional assessment opportunity (ask your College Assessment Coordinator or Jessica Dennis, Director of Assessment for more information).

Developed & Well-Developed

- Target a new PLO for assessment this year.
- Develop a more comprehensive 5-year assessment plan that targets several PLOs on a schedule.
- Plan a follow-up study to a previously conducted assessment.

Assessment Process:

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Assessment Process	Program does not have a process in place to discuss learning outcomes or collect and review assessment evidence.	There is evidence that program faculty discusses learning outcomes and how to improve teaching, but **program-level assessment evidence has not been collected or discussed**. Department **does not seem to have an active assessment committee**.	Assessment committee or assessment coordinator **interprets data and shares** with department. Department **faculty discuss results** and determine improvement actions	Assessment committee regularly collects data and shares with department. Department faculty discuss results and there is evidence that improvement **actions have been taken to close the loop**. Results are **shared with relevant stakeholders** such as administrators, alumni, etc. They may **collaborate with others**, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve results.

Recommendations for this program:

Initial & Emerging

- Since your assessment process is the initial or emerging stage, we encourage you to send 2 faculty members to attend the **"Assessment in 5 Easy Steps"** workshop on Monday, Nov. 20 from 10-12 in the Library Community Room (Lib North B131). To RSVP use this link: http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/rsvp-assessment-5-easy-steps-workshop
- Form an assessment committee or task your curriculum committee with assessment.
- Ask your assessment committee to develop a plan to collect data on at least 1 program learning outcome this year.
- Ask your assessment committee to analyze the results from a previously conducted assessment and present these results to program faculty. Be sure to discuss changes that could be made to curriculum or teaching based on these results.

Developed & Well-Developed

- Make sure the assessment committee meets regularly and shares results yearly.
- Use results to make changes to curriculum and teaching.
- Look for opportunities to share results with relevant stakeholders.
- Seek input from students, alumni, or employers.

APPENDIX A: CAL STATE LA INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES AND GOALS

Institutional Learning Goals

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: WSCUC's Core Competencies

In the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*, Criteria for Review 2.2a states:

> Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking.

Institutions are free to define each core competency in a way that makes sense for the institution, its mission, its values, and the needs of its student body.

Critical thinking- the ability to think in a way that is clear, reasoned, reflective, informed by evidence, and aimed at deciding what to believe or do. Dispositions supporting critical thinking include open-mindedness and motivation to seek the truth.

Quantitative Reasoning- the ability to apply mathematical concepts to the interpretation and analysis of quantitative information in order to solve a wide range of problems, from those arising in pure and applied research to everyday issues and questions. It may include such dimensions as ability to apply math skills, judge reasonableness, communicate quantitative information, and recognize the limits of mathematical or statistical methods.

Oral Communication- communication by means of spoken language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. In addition to speech, oral communication may employ visual aids, body language, intonation, and other non-verbal elements to support the conveyance of meaning and connection with the audience. Oral communication may include speeches, presentations, discussions, dialogue, and other forms of interpersonal communication, either delivered face to face or mediated technologically.

Written Communication- communication by means of written language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. Written communication may appear in many forms or genres. Successful written communication depends of mastery of conventions, faculty with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience and other situation-specific factors.

Information Literacy- according the Association of College and Research Libraries, the ability to "recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use the needed information" for a wide range of purposes. An information-literate individual is able to determine the

extent of information needed, access it, evaluate it and its sources, use the information effectively, and do so ethically and legally.

APPENDIX B: EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT MEASURES

The following are common **direct measures** used to assess program learning outcomes:
- Published (Standardized) test (e.g., Major Field Test)
- Class Presentations
- Off-campus Presentations (for clients, agencies, etc.)
- Research Project Reports
- Case Studies
- Term Papers
- Portfolios
- Artistic Performances, Recitals, & Products
- Capstone Products
- Poster Presentations
- Comprehensive Exams
- Thesis, Dissertation
- Pass Rates on Certification or Licensure Exams
- Group Projects
- Oral Exams or Competency Interviews
- Simulations
- Embedded Questions in Exams

The following are common **indirect measures** used to assess program learning outcomes:
- Student Survey
- Student Interview or Focus Groups
- Alumni Survey
- Employer Survey
- Faculty Survey
- Placement Rates
- Exit (end of program) Survey or Interviews
- Reflection Essays
- Diaries or Journals
- Data from Institutional Surveys (NSSE)
- Curriculum/Syllabus Analysis

APPENDIX C: EXAMPLES OF USE OF ASSESSMENTS RESULTS

The following are some examples of **"closing the loop"** actions involving 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