School of Education

Rubric Element	Assessors Rating	Comments
1. Mission Statement	**Developed/Highly Developed**	Mission statement written for school, but not individual programs.
2. Definition of PLOs	**Developed (15%)/Highly Developed (85%)**	There was confusion on what the PLOs were as a set of PLOs were presented as well as Candidate LOs, which were used to align to curriculum. See comments.
3. Alignment of PLOs to Mission Statement	**Highly Developed**	No work needed.
4. Development of PLOs	**Developed/Highly Developed**	Suggest adjusting verbiage in outcomes past "develop" and to ensure the outcomes reach the highest levels of learning on Bloom's Taxonomy.
5. Alignment of PLOs on a Curriculum Map	**Developed/Highly Developed**	Introduce and Mastery levels missing from some curriculum maps. See comments.
6. Multi-Year Assessment Plan	**Developed/Highly Developed**	Suggest creating plan for each program. Some plans unclear. See comments.
7. Methods of Assessment	**Developed/Highly Developed**	It would assist assessors to provide a table or something that maps outcomes to methods to ensure every outcome is being assessed. See comments.
8. Criteria for Success	**Initial/Emerging**	Only provided for CTA assessments. Ensure criteria set for each method of assessment. See comments.
9. Direct or Indirect Measures	**Developed/Highly Developed**	Difficult for assessors to tell if each outcome had a direct measure. See comments.
10. Collection of Evidence	**Emerging/Developed**	Ensure all assessment data is collected and present in report how data is shared with students. See comments.
11. Analysis of Results	**Emerging/Developed**	Would be greater developed with criteria for success set.
12. Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations	**Emerging/Developed /Highly Developed**	Conclusions sometimes difficult to relate to assessment results, and seem to reflect on assessment more than student learning. See comments.
13. Planning Change "Closing the Loop"	**Initial/Emerging /Developed**	Level of faculty involvement unclear for many. Changes vaguely related to assessment results. Some results not yet discussed. See comments.
14. Activities or		*It was determined after the rubric was developed that this*

Resources Needed		*element belongs with Program Review.*

Assessor Comments:

Counseling PPS

- Mission Statement: Wonderful mission statement for School of Education, rubric asks for program mission statement
- There is an excellent School mission statement, but a program purpose statement is not evident.
- Definition of PLOs: Whenever PLOs contain the word "and" there is a possibility that you have more than one outcome. For example, Empower 2. "conduct, analyze, and evaluate research data and comunicate results" - you may have more than one learning outcome here.
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission: The PLO themes--equip, transform, and empower--do not seem to match up with similar language or concepts in the School mission statement.
- Development of PLOs: Most of the learning outcomes are at the demonstrate and understand level. Is it possible to move these to a higher cognitive level?
- Curriculum Map: There is no "I" category, but that seems appropriate for graduate level instruction.
- Not all of the courses need to address every learning outcome. Is it possible to have certain courses address specific learning outcomes?
- Multi-year plan: Is there a schedule where some of the learning outcomes are assessed in subsequent years?
- Methods of Assessment: It would be easier if each of the PLOs were aligned to the method of assessment.
- Criteria for Success: The only performance target specified is for the Dispositions Assessments. That said, each of the assessments is very well-described and has an accompanying rubric.
- Performance targets are not identified, although implied in the analysis of the data.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As the PLOs are not aligned to the assignments that were assessed, it is difficult to know whether every PLO has a direct measure of assessment.
- Collection of Evidence: The extent of pilot-testing--and sharing data with students--is unclear.
- Some of the data anslysis describes candidate involvement, but it is not clear that these assessments are shared with the students.
- Analysis of Results: Excellent analysis of coursework assessments, but analysis appears to be missing for dispositions assessments, exit surveys, and follow-up surveys (although the date given for follow-up surveys was 2011, so it may not have been available at the time of this report).
- Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations: Recommendations refer to what students can do to improve learning, but not how instructors will help them do that.
- There is no clear "conclusions" section as such; the "Use of Results" content seems to be getting at this, but the connection between the "proposed changes made" and the results/data is unclear.
- Planning Change: Faculty involvement in the planning and assessment process appears quite strong. The connection of the results to recommendations is unclear, however.

- It is not clear to what extent the faculty discuss these results.

Ed Leadership – Clear

- Definition of PLOs: I'm assuming that the CTC PLOs are also the program's learning outcomes.
- According to the responses in the data provided, there appears the potential for a disconnect between how PLO 2d (which aligns with ILO3 and CPSEL5) is worded and how students understand it.
- Curriculum Map: Does every learning outcome need to be addressed in each of the courses? That would be a heavy burden for each of these courses.
- Again, not a statement on the cohesiveness of the curriculum, but there are no indications that students will achieve mastery of any of the PLOs on the curriculum map, which may be an area to reassess. As the continuation of the preliminary program, it would seem that this would not be the case.
- Multi-Year Plan: Are each of the learning outcomes assessed every year? It is not clear in this multi-year assessment plan.
- Again, not difficult to sustain, but with the number of places where the program is self-reporting as needing a larger pool of respondents and more time for assessments to be more fully implemented, the overall effectiveness of the plan will be more apparent in the coming year.
- Criteria for Success: It does not appear that performance targets have been identified for the signature assignments and the dispositions assessment.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: Given the survey response to the importance of the program's focus on noble character, this particular area and the assessment of it may need to be revisited.
- Collection of Evidence: As stated earlier, assessments are in place but need more time to gather more useful data and determine how that data will be communicated to students.
- Analysis of Results: I wanted to see a clearer connection between the data tables and the analysis and discussion of the program data.
- See comment above.
- Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations: Part of the Plan of Action appears a little succinct, for example, Implement. How would the implementation improve the student learning?
- Most conclusions seem to draw toward how to better assess the program rather than what changes the data is suggesting need be made to the curriculum. This should change with time.
- Planning change: Some changes to assessment process are suggested. Difficult to tell how this is related to data results. Don't see reflection on how it relates to an improvement of student learning
- It's not clear how many of the faculty discuss this data.

Ed Leadership – Preliminary

- Definition of PLOs: Whenever you include an "and" in the learning outcome statement, check to see if you actually have two learning outcomes. For example, Promotes the success of all students by

modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity. You could make this into two learning outcomes.

- Development of PLOs: Check the use of "demonstrates", is there another word that could exemplify what you want students to know, understand or be able to do?
- One note on this is that the majority of the PLOs in this program rely on demonstration, which without more specific langauge, could remain in lower order thinking.
- Multi-Year Plan: This assessment plan is similar to all others in the SOE - I'm not sure whether the CTC or NCATE would give you the latitude to focus on several learning outcomes per year.
- The plan, given its link to the CTC cycle, is sustainable, but there is a lot of ground to cover in terms of the measures for the data being collected.
- Methods of Assessment: Glad to see the alignment of the course learning outcomes to the assessment activities. Now to align the PLOs to the assessment activities.
- Criteria for Success: No indicators of performance targets included in the assessment activities but in analysis of data indication is given of students meeting or exceeding expectations.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As PLOs not aligned to assessment activities it is difficult to determine whether every PLO has a direct measure of assessment.
- Collection of Evidence: I think it's understood that all of the outcomes and their methods of measurement are shared with the students, although it could be stated more explicitly.
- There is definite collecttion of data (or a solid plan for the collection of data). There is no indication of how or if that information is shared with students.
- Analysis of Results: Analysis of Data also included Areas for Improvement, This could have been expanded on in the Use of Results section.
- The analysis that is here is very complete. As the assessments that have been recently implemented come online, the evidence suggests it will be even more so.
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: Overall, this is a very solid plan.
- Planning Change: Here it's not clear how the faculty are involved in the discussions. I think they are but the report doesn't spell it out.

MATL-Clear Credential

- Mission Statement: The clear credential program obviously does not bear its own mission statement, at least in my opinion. As I noted in the assessment of the reading certification, the overal mission statement could be more discipline specific.
- Definition of PLOs: The Empower 2. whenever you use "and" there is a possibility that the learning outcome could be divided into two different learning outcomes.
- I would look closely at just how similar the definitions of PLOs 1c and 3a are. As they read now, they most likely should be consolidated. If they really are two separate ideas, then the wording of the two need a good deal more differentiation.
- Development of PLOs: "Knows" and "demonstrates" are evident here and generall are at the lower cognitive levels. Is there another level to which the students could aspire?
- PLO 2b seems to need a bit more specificity.
- Multi-year plan: It would be easier to understand the multi-year plan if it distinguished between the programs in the SOE.

- Not sure if this is too difficult to sustain, merely unsure given how many indicators were listed as either unverified due to small student population or the area's newness in terms of it being assessed. These issues should be addressed by the next year's assessment I would suspect.
- Methods of Assessment: Including the PLOs here would be helpful in showing how the program learning outcomes are met by the signature assignments. The reader is assumed to make the connection.
- As noted in the report, there are a few assessment sets that need either more time or more participation in order to yield more meaningful data.
- Criteria for Success: Performance levels for the signature assignments are not identified.
- Collection of Evidence: As you were not able to collect adequate data for some of the methods of assessment, what faculty discussion could remedy that?
- Again, some of the measures are developing. Also, unsure of what type of data the surveys are producing based on this report. And there is no indication that this data is being shared with students.
- Analysis of Results: Analysis is very succinct and could use more elaboration.
- See comment from Collection of Evidence.
- Planning Change: It is not clear to what extent the faculty discuss this data.
- Results are clearly being used to reshape courses and content delivery. There are some indications that it is also impacting Outcomes, but those indications are indirect or unclear.

MATL-Reading Certificate

- Mission Statement: This statement is clear, but feels like a number of different discipline descriptors could be subsituted for "educators" (i.e. business professionals, writers, nurses, etc.) and it would work just as well. Could be a little more unique.
- Definition of PLOs: Almost all of the PLOs for this certification program are specific and make sense. The only one that reads as a bit vague is 2b, which discusses in general the concepts of reflection and noble character, but lack the specificity of the others.
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission:
- Development of PLOs: Could "Demonstrates" be moved to a higher cognitive level?
- Curriculum Map: PLOs 2b and 3b are not covered in the curriculum. How could they be incorporated into the curriculum?
- This score is not a statement on the overall cohesiveness of the curriculum. Rather, it is just a note that none of the PLOs are listed as being taught to mastery level on the curriculum map. This may be by design but bears some further thinking.
- Multi-Year Plan: It is not clear when each of the learning outcomes will be assessed in this multi-year assessment plan.
- Excellent plan that seems very sustainable. There are some questions I have about how particular data will be used, but those will be addressed in the next rubric and do not appear to make the plan more difficult to make work.
- Methods of Assessment: It would be helpful to include the PLOs that will be assessed with each of the signature assignments. It is left to the reader to make this connection.

- The assessment methods are clear. What is not clear in this report is how they specifically inform department members how the program needs to be changed as a result of the data that is collected.
- Criteria for Success: There appears to be some implication of performance targets when reviewing the data charts but they are not explicitly identified in the Methods of Assessment.
- Every course and facet of the program contains at least one assessment device.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: Each of the PLOs are not assessed.
- Not sure I see the direct measure for 2b.
- Collection of Evidence: Again, looking solely at this report, an assessor would be unable to see the ways in which performance on many of these forms of evidence are tied to the aggregate outcome on the assignment as presented. Also, more specific use of the data for program improvement seems possible. And there is no note regarding how this information is shared with students.
- Analysis of Results: There needs to be a clearer connection to the data that was collected and how it led to the conclusions.
- In keeping with my comment on the collection of evidence, it is clear that the faculty is analyzing the data. However, the report could be more specific in describing the ways in which that analysis is made along with what is done with the data drawn from the exit and follow-up surveys.
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: There is a clear table listing the changes made as a result of the data collected, but there is no explanation of how those results prompted the changes that will be made, nor how this will impact the certificate program as a whole in the future.
- Planning Change: It is not clear that faculty discuss these results.

MATL-Multiple Subject

It is obvious that the SOE is doing an outstanding job with ongoing program assessment and improvement for compliance with many different evaluators. The level of detail in the report and the many different forms of assessment are quite impressive. As an evaluator of the Annual Assessment Report, I would like to make a general recommendation that this report be more focused on the Program Learning Outcomes. Clearer identification of PLOs is needed, and there should be a stronger correlation between the PLOs and the various methods and uses of assessment.

- Mission Statement: Excellent Mission Statement - consider additional language specific to each major program (multiple subject, single subject, etc); probably okay to leave as a generic mission statement for the school of education
- Question: Are all the Grad Ed programs using the same mission Statement?
- Definition of PLOs: For the empower learning outcome - would scholarly, professional and spiritual growth be actually 3 learning outcomes?
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission: Equip, Transform and Empower are a wonderful alignment to the Learn, Grow, Serve ILOs.
- Development of PLOs: Evaluated PLOs listed on page 2 titled "Program Learning Outcomes" under CTC Standard Driven Candidate Outcomes
- It becomes confusing when you have PLOs, Candidate LOs, TPAs etc. You may want to have a short summary attached outlining how these terms are used.
- Curriculum Map: Candidate Learning Outcomes (which are different from the PLOs on page 2) are well aligned with courses listed on the curriculum map
- Question: Does the SOE assume I=Introduction at the undergraduate level.

- Multi-Year Plan: Multi-year plan follows the CTC Seven Year Cycle; consider aligning activities with PLOs
- Methods of Assessment: Report seems to use the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) for analysis and not the PLOs/CLOs; consider addressing the PLOs with the TPA data collected
- What instrument is used for the assessment of the dispositions? You have data charts and discussion of findings but to which PLO/CLO do these relate? Interesting data but not sure how it relates to what you wanted the student to know, understand or be able to do at the end of the program.
- Criteria for Success: Although in most instances the results appear successful, there is no specific measure of success indicated
- No evidence that performance targets have been set for any of the methods of assessment.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: If all signature assignments are assessed, then direct measure used for all LOs.
- Several measures are utilized but they are not aligned with PLOs
- As it's not clear which assessment activities belong to which PLOs/CLOs, it's difficult to determine whether each PLO/CLO has a direct measure.
- Collection of Evidence: Again, varying levels of evidence are collected but not certain how they relate to the PLOs/CLOs.
- Analysis of Results: No criteria for success
- Analysis related to tasks but not certain how the tasks relate to the PLOs/CLOs.
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations:
- Planning Change: Several mentions that this will be discussed.
- Meetings for faculty to discuss material have been scheduled but not yet taken place.

MATL-Single Subject

It is obvious that the SOE is doing an outstanding job with ongoing program assessment and improvement for compliance with many different evaluators. The level of detail in the report and the many different forms of assessment are quite impressive. As an evaluator of the Annual Assessment Report, I would like to make a general recommendation that this report be more focused on the Program Learning Outcomes. Clearer identification of PLOs is needed, and there should be a stronger correlation between the PLOs and the various methods and uses of assessment.

- Mission Statement: Excellent Mission Statement - consider additional language specific to each major program (multiple subject, single subject, etc); probably okay to leave as a generic mission statement for the school of education
- Development of PLOs: Evaluated PLOs listed on page 2 titled "Program Learning Outcomes" under CTC Standard Driven Candidate Outcomes
- Curriculum Map: Candidate Learning Outcomes (which are different from the PLOs on page 2) are well aligned with courses listed on the curriculum map
- Multi-Year Plan: How is the multi-year plan differentiated for each of the degrees in the School of Education? Are all learning outcomes assessed on the same schedule?
- Multi-year plan follows the CTC Seven Year Cycle; consider aligning activities with PLOs
- Methods of Assessment: Report seems to use the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) for analysis and not the PLOs/CLOs; consider addressing the PLOs with the TPA data collected
- Criteria for Success: There don't appear to be performance targets set in the Assessment Activities section. It will be difficult to know whether the achievement is at the desired level.

- Although in most instances the results appear successful, there is no specific measure of success indicated
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As the assessment activities are not aligned to the learning outcomes, it is difficult to know whether each learning outcome has a direct measure.
- Several measures are utilized but they are not aligned with PLOs
- Analysis of Results: No criteria for success
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: It would be helpful to tie the Use of Results to the specific learning outcomes.

MAT- Special Education – Mild/Moderate

It is obvious that the SOE is doing an outstanding job with ongoing program assessment and improvement for compliance with many different evaluators. The level of detail in the report and the many different forms of assessment are quite impressive. As an evaluator of the Annual Assessment Report, I would like to make a general recommendation that this report be more focused on the Program Learning Outcomes. Clearer identification of PLOs is needed, and there should be a stronger correlation between the PLOs and the various methods and uses of assessment.

- Mission Statement: Excellent Mission Statement - consider additional language specific to each major program (multiple subject, single subject, etc); probably okay to leave as a generic mission statement for the school of education
- Development of PLOs: Term "reflect" is used many times; it is difficult to tell what is meant, but it seems to be more at the application level than the synthesis level on Blooms
- Evaluated PLOs listed on page 2 titled â€œProgram Learning Outcomesâ€• under CTC Standard Driven Candidate Outcomes
- Curriculum Map: Candidate Learning Outcomes (which are different from the PLOs on page 2) are well aligned with courses listed on the curriculum map
- Multi-Year Plan: Wondering where each PLO fits into this Seven Year Cycle of assessment activities. Are all PLOs assess every year?
- Multi-year plan follows the CTC Seven Year Cycle; consider aligning activities with PLOs
- Methods of Assessment: Report seems to use the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) for analysis and not the PLOs/CLOs; consider addressing the PLOs with the TPA data collected
- Criteria for Success: At what level should students perform these assessment activities - percentages show up later in the report but are not articulated in the Assessment Activities section.
- Although in most instances the results appear successful, there is no specific measure of success indicated
- Direct or Indirect Measures: The specific learning outcomes are not associated with each assessment activity. Thus it is difficult to determine whether each PLO has a direct measure.
- Several measures are utilized but they are not aligned with PLOs
- Collection of Evidence: While it is evident that the rubrics and TPA assignments are shared with student it might be helpful to note this.
- Analysis of Results: No criteria for success

MAT- Special Education –Moderate/Severe

It is obvious that the SOE is doing an outstanding job with ongoing program assessment and improvement for compliance with many different evaluators. The level of detail in the report and the many different forms of assessment are quite impressive. As an evaluator of the Annual Assessment Report, I would like to make a general recommendation that this report be more focused on the Program Learning Outcomes. Clearer identification of PLOs is needed, and there should be a stronger correlation between the PLOs and the various methods and uses of assessment.

- Mission Statement: Excellent Mission Statement - consider additional language specific to each major program (multiple subject, single subject, etc); probably okay to leave as a generic mission statement for the school of education
- Development of PLOs: Evaluated PLOs listed on page 2 titled "Program Learning Outcomes" under CTC Standard Driven Candidate Outcomes
- Curriculum Map: Candidate Learning Outcomes (which are different from the PLOs on page 2) are well aligned with courses listed on the curriculum map
- Multi-Year Plan: As you have the same multi-year plan for all the learning outcomes, do your external accrediting agencies allow for a more measured approach to assessment? Some outcomes in one year, others in the next year?
- Multi-year plan follows the CTC Seven Year Cycle; consider aligning activities with PLOs
- Methods of Assessment: Report seems to use the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPA) for analysis and not the PLOs/CLOs; consider addressing the PLOs with the TPA data collected
- Criteria for Success: Performance targets are not articulated in the assessment activities - so it is not clear whether the findings match what you had anticipated.
- Although in most instances the results appear successful, there is no specific measure of success indicated
- Direct or Indirect Measures: You It is unclear which assessment activities attach to a specific learning outcome. Therefore it is unclear whether each learning outcome has a direct measure attached to it.
- Several measures are utilized but they are not aligned with PLOs
- Collection of Evidence: Which assessment activities are associated with a specific learning outcome? Do all the assignments assess every learning outcome?
- Analysis of Results: No criteria for success

MAT- CWA Counseling Certificate

There is much to commend this Report, but more data--and specific analysis of that data with accompanying conclusions and recommendations--would strengthen it greatly.

- Mission Statement: There is an excellent School mission statement, but a program purpose statement is not evident.
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission: The PLO themes--equip, transform, and empower--do not seem to match up with similar language or concepts in the School mission statement.
- Development of PLOs: Most of the CLOs are at the "demonstrate" level.
- Curriculum Map: While program learning outcomes do include the highest cognitive level ("Assess"), I am concerned that every course includes at least D and M levels of proficiency for every learning outcome. Some explanatory text would be helpful.

- Does every learning outcome need to be assessed? And is every course a stand-alone course, where Developed, Master and Practice are evidenced?
- Multi-Year Plan: Are any of these learning outcomes assessed on a cycle or are they all assessed every year?
- Criteria for Success: The only performance target specified is for the Dispositions Assessments, for which a "one or two rating" requires the student to meet with the professor and Program Director.
- There are no criteria for success identified in the methods of assessment
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As the PLOs are not aligned to the methods of assessment it is difficult to determine whether every PLO has a direct measure of assessment.
- Collection of Evidence: This appears to be the case, but the actual "collection of evidence" is not included in the report.
- Analysis of Results: Technically there are data tables, but they have no content--just labels (see "Summary of Data Collected" section). Interestingly, there is a "discussion of findings" that refers to known data, but those data do not appear in the tables.
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: The only relevant content is in the paragraph of text on page 9, and this text is not supported by presented data.
- This is mostly a plan for the future.
- Planning Change: There is a "sense" of faculty engagement in this process but little supporting evidence.

MATL – CLAD Certificate

- Mission Statement: The Report includes an excellent School mission statement, but a program purpose statement is not evident.
- Definition of PLOs: Not all acronyms are explained--e.g., what is "CTEL?"
- Whenever an "and" is included, there is the possibility of two learning outcomes. For example, models professional and ethical standards and dispositions. You could divide this into at least two learning outcomes.
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission: The PLO themes--equip, transform, and empower--do not seem to match up with similar language or concepts in the School mission statement.
- Development of PLOs: The reviewer is not finding PLO language associated with the highest levels of development (synthesis and evaluation).
- Could some of the "demonstrates" be moved to a higher cognitive level?
- Curriculum Map: Not all PLOs need to be covered in every course. It is possible to focus on one or two for each course.
- Multi-Year Plan: Is there a time table when each PLO will be assessed, or is every PLO assessed every year?
- Methods of Assessment: It would be helpful to have each PLO identified and then the assessment activities outlined for that PLO.
- Criteria for Success: No performance targets are evident.
- Performance targets not identified although implied in the data analysis.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As it is unclear which PLOs are assessed in the assessment activities, it is difficult to determine whether every PLO has a direct measure of assessment.

- Collection of Evidence: This appears to be the case, but the actual "collection of evidence" is not included in the report. The small population of students available is no doubt a contributing factor (see p. 8).
- Analysis of Results:
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: The "Use of Results" section (p. 9) is interesting and thoughtful but not tied to specific data or findings.
- Planning Change: The intent to use data seems clear, but this application is not present in the Report.

MAT –Special Education – Clear

There is some excellent content in this Report. It could be improved in some respects, but in many regards, it is exemplary.

- Mission Statement: There is an excellent School mission statement, but a program purpose statement is not evident.
- Definition of PLOs:
- Alignment of PLOs to Mission: The PLO themes--equip, transform, and empower--do not seem to match up with similar language or concepts in the School mission statement.
- Development of PLOs: Could "demonstrates" be moved to a higher cognitive level?
- Curriculum Map:
- Multi-Year Plan: Are all of these learning outcomes assessed every year? That is not clear from this multi-year assessment plan.
- Methods of Assessment: It would be helpful to restate the PLO for each of the methods of assessment - would make it easier for your reader.
- Criteria for Success: No performance targets are evident.
- Performance targets are not stated although they implied in the analysis of the data.
- Direct or Indirect Measures: As the PLOs are not identified with the methods of assessment, it is difficult to determine whether every PLO has a direct measure of assessment.
- Collection of Evidence: The extent of pilot-testing--and sharing data with students--is unclear.
- Analysis of Results: Tables 7-9 constitute an excellent analysis of coursework assessments. Unfortunately, there were no responses to exit surveys, either from alumni or from employers, Dispositions assessments, with only a single student reporting, were meaningless.
- Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations: There is an excellent discussion along these lines in the "Use of Results" section on pages 22-23.
- It would be helpful to use the data in forming your conclusions.
- Planning Change: See, e.g., the discussion of GED 650 on p. 22.
- It is not clear to what extent faculty are involved in the discussion of the data and the implications of this data.

Liberal Studies

- Definition of PLOs: These are overall strong PLOs. However, some of them include more than one thing being measured, which is technically OK, but does make the assessment more complicated. For instance, 1(a) involves the assessment of presentation skills "one-on-one and with groups." This means that there must be a means of assessing both the one-on-one skills and the group skills, which may

require two different means of assessment (although not necessarily). Likewise, 3(a) says "reflect on and engage in" (2 different actions) for both "professional and spiritual growth" (2 different types of growth) in "professional, educational, and personal settings" (3 different areas). That adds up to a lot of different assessment for just that one PLO. I think that "reflect on" should probably be deleted, since that's awfully hard to measure, and perhaps "and/or" could be used in some places to help reduce the number of different means of assessment you need for each PLO.

- Development of PLOs: It looks to me like your PLOs do reflect the spirit of the higher levels of mastery (synthesis, evaluating, creating, etc.), but the language of your PLOs doesn't entirely reflect that. Some slight wording changes to reflect the verbs in Bloom's taxonomy for "Synthesis" and "Evaluation" would bring the language more in line with what I think the PLOs are really getting at in terms of having the students create, design, assess, evaluate, synthesize, prioritize, etc.
- Curriculum Map: Where is Introduce assumed to take place?
- There don't seem to be any "I"s-- courses in which the PLOs are introduced.
- Multi-Year Plan: There should be a multi-year assessment plan specifically for the Liberal Studies program.
- Just fyi, in the second paragraph of the Multiple Year Assessment Plan, it says "CTS" where I think it means "CTC."
- Criteria for Success: Only criteria for success was on CalTPA
- What target scores had you set for the achievement level in your assessments?
- Collection of Evidence: How are you sharing this with students - do they know the benchmarks you hope for them to achieve?
- Analysis of Results: What's missing here are the measures for success. Other than the California Teacher Performance Assessments, I don't see any goals/benchmarks listed for what scores students would need to achieve in order to have successfully mastered that PLO. i.e. Is the department aiming for an average score of at least 3 on a 4-point rubric? Or does it depend on the PLO? For instance, regarding the Math final exam, the analysis says that the students are considered proficient on criterion 2 and 3, having scored an average of 3.08 and 2.00, but that criterion 1, with an average score of 3.44, is an area for growth. If 2.00 is proficient for one, but 3.44 is not proficient for another, are there different goals for what students will be able to achieve on those? Including an extra column with the minimum score needed to be considered proficient (i.e. the department's minimum goal for the students) would help clear that up. Also, when listing the average scores, it should also be stated what that score is out of (i.e. an average of 3 out of 4)... that is done for some of the tables, but not all.