

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

## ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT **REFERENCE SHEET:**

**NOTE:** This reference sheet consists of the following information:

1. Cal State LA Institutional Learning Outcomes and Goals (*page 1*)
2. Cal State LA Institutional Graduate Learning Outcomes (*page 2*)
3. Cal State LA's General Education Learning Outcomes (*page 2*)
4. WSCUC's Core Competencies (*page 3*)
5. Examples of Assessment Measures (*page 4*)
6. Examples of Use of Assessments Results (*page 4*)
7. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Rubric (*page 5*)
8. Assessment Evidence Rubric (*page 5*)
9. Assessment Process Rubric (*page 6*)
10. Assessment Process Rubric (*page 6*)

## 1. 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

## 2. Cal State LA Institutional Graduate Learning Outcomes

**Graduate students at Cal State LA will be able to:**

- 1) Demonstrate mastery of major theories, concepts, approaches to inquiry and/or practices relevant to the field of study.
- 2) Demonstrate information literacy appropriate to the field of study.
- 3) Identify and evaluate diverse perspectives, assumptions, and conventions within the field of study.
- 4) Critically examine the power and limitations of quantitative and/or qualitative evidence in the evaluation, construction, and communication of arguments in the field of study.
- 5) Demonstrate communicative fluency appropriate to the field of study. Communicative fluency can include multiple expressive modes.
- 6) Articulate how advancing knowledge or practice in their field of study contributes to the public good.
- 7) Frame and examine a controversy or problem through research, projects, papers, exhibits, or performances in the field of study.
- 8) Situate the field of study and its relevance within a broader context, including – but not limited to- social, intellectual, and/or applied professional contexts.
- 9) Apply appropriate ethical standards or practices within the field of study.

Proposed to Academic Senate 10/25/18 by Educational Policy Committee

## 3. Cal State LA's General Education Learning Outcomes

The General Education program at Cal State LA is defined by a set of learning outcomes that are aligned with the Cal State LA Institutional Learning outcomes and the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) outcomes promoted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and adopted by the California State University System.

### 1. Knowledge: Mastery of Content and Processes of Inquiry

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate understanding of the physical and natural world.
- demonstrate understanding of contemporary events within political and historical contexts.
- demonstrate understanding of the diversity of cultures and communities in the United States and abroad.
- demonstrate understanding of constructions, institutions, and structures of power and privilege in societies as well as strategies used to challenge existing inequalities.
- demonstrate understanding of a range of disciplinary ways of knowing.
- demonstrate understanding of creative expression in the context of the relevant art form and intellectual history.
- demonstrate understanding of race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic class

### 2. Proficiency: Intellectual Skills

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate civic literacy that would enable them to participate effectively in a democratic society

- use inquiry processes, including quantitative and qualitative reasoning and critical and creative thinking, to engage with contemporary and enduring questions.
- find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making and problem solving.
- read, speak and write effectively.
- demonstrate an ability to work collaboratively.

### **3. Engagement: Local and Global Communities**

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- demonstrate the capacity to engage meaningfully with diverse communities.
- demonstrate understanding of how individuals affect society and the environment.
- demonstrate the capacity to make well informed, ethical, and socially responsible decisions.
- demonstrate understanding of the interconnectedness of local and global communities.
- demonstrate literacy in the perspectives and needs of individuals and groups.

### **4. Transformation: Integrative Learning**

Students who successfully complete GE will be able to:

- integrate academic learning with life through project-based experiences.
- integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex, enduring, and emerging issues.

## **4. 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.

## 5. 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

## 6. 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

## 7. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Rubric

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

## 8. Assessment Evidence Rubric

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

## 9. Assessment Process Rubric

	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.	<p>There is evidence that program faculty discusses learning outcomes and how to improve teaching, but <b>program-level assessment evidence has not been collected or discussed.</b></p> <p>Department <b>does not seem to have an active assessment committee.</b></p>	<p>Assessment committee or assessment coordinator <b>interprets data and shares</b> with department.</p> <p>Department <b>faculty discuss results</b> and determine improvement actions</p>	<p>Assessment committee regularly collects data and shares with department.</p> <p>Department faculty discuss results and there is evidence that improvement <b>actions have been taken to close the loop.</b></p> <p>Results are <b>shared with relevant stakeholders</b> such as administrators, alumni, etc.</p> <p>They may <b>collaborate with others</b>, such as librarians or Student Affairs professionals, to improve results.</p>

## 10. GE Assessment Rubric

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
GE Assessment	<p><b>Not clear</b> that potentially valid <b>evidence for GE outcomes</b> is collected.</p> <p><b>Individual instructors use idiosyncratic criteria</b> to assess student work.</p> <p><b>Results for GE outcomes are not discussed</b> and there is little or no collective use of findings.</p>	<p><b>Evidence has been collected</b> for some GE outcomes and there has been <b>discussion of relevant criteria</b> for assessing these outcomes.</p> <p><b>Results were discussed</b> by relevant faculty and <b>used to make adjustments</b> to GE courses.</p> <p>Coordination of GE courses is inconsistent and <b>individual instructors may not use a consistent set of criteria</b> to assess student work.</p>	<p>Appropriate evidence is collected; <b>faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics</b>, to assess student attainment of each outcome.</p> <p><b>Instructors and/or reviewers of student work are calibrated</b> to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and/or faculty check for inter-rater reliability.</p> <p>Results for each outcome are <b>collected, discussed by relevant faculty, and regularly used</b> to improve the program.</p>	<p><b>Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, have been pilot-tested and refined</b> and typically shared with students.</p> <p>Instructors and/or reviewers are calibrated with <b>high inter-rater reliability.</b></p> <p>Relevant faculty routinely discusses results, <b>plan improvements, secure necessary resources</b>, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others to improve the program. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved</p>

\*\*\*\*\*