### Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

**CSUF April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] How many formal learning outcomes have been established?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Where are those learning outcomes published (e.g., catalog; syllabus; other materials)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Other than GPA, what data/evidence are used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone; course; body of work; review; licensure examination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] How are the findings used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### As the institutional Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] University Learning Goals are published at the following locations: OAEE website; Catalog; AcademicSenate website; [University Policy Statement 300.001]. As such, the ULGs are assessed through the assessment of the SLOs in the degree program. A wide variety of disciplines types (described above) are used to assess the various SLOs at the program level, with priorities given to embedded measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are aligned with the University Learning Goals (ULGs). As such, the ULGs are assessed through the assessment of the SLOs in the degree program. A wide variety of disciplines types (described above) are used to assess the various SLOs at the program level, with priorities given to embedded measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty are the primary drivers of assessment, and thus serve as the primary group that collect and interprets the evidence. The university has established a six-step assessment process through thorough faculty/staff consultation, in which the collection, analysis and interpretation of assessment data is a significant (i.e. Step 4). In addition, the six-step assessment process explicitly calls for “improvement actions” (i.e. Step 5). Highlighting the need to use assessment to inform practice. While the six-step process guides the assessment efforts on campus, the implementation of the process varies by program/department/colleges. In some cases, the program faculty are presented with the assessment findings, and they collectively make interpretations and recommend improvement actions. In other cases, a committee of faculty members perform the initial review and interpretation and then presents the recommendations to the entire faculty for approval.

Assessment findings, as interpreted by the course instructors and the GE committee, will be described in the GE Annual Report (written by the Director of Undergraduate Studies & General Education and the Director of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness). Improvement actions will be solicited from the GE Committee at the first GE Committee meeting of the fall semester. The GE Committee, in collaboration with the Academic Programs Office, will determine a plan to follow-up on any indications that emerge from the data of need for improvements.

### For general education program and/or undergraduate institution:

|---------|---------|

The campus has recently (spring 2015) established GE Student Graduation Outcomes (SGOs) and Outcomes as well as the GE Assessment Plan. The 2015-2016 academic year is the first year in which the GE assessment plan was piloted. Per plan, the instructors whose GE courses were sampled for GE assessment summaries and interpret the results. The summary is then forwarded to the GE committee of the Academic Senate which comprise faculty. Working with the Director of Undergraduate Studies & General Education and the Director of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness, the GE committee interprets the findings aggregated across faculty and courses, whenever possible, as indicators of the quality of the GE program.

Assessment results are reviewed by program faculty in a micro/macro relationship, i.e., an individual class in relationship to the overall curriculum structure, and how curriculum content within one area is cross-pollinated into other areas for greater breadth.

### Lift each degree program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts, B.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Assist; GE website; Catalog; Individual department website [University Policy Statement 2013]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-embedded assignment(s); Student survey (in-depth measure) 

The campus has recently (spring 2015) established GE Student Graduation Outcomes (SGOs) and Outcomes as well as the GE Assessment Plan. The 2015-2016 academic year is the first year in which the GE assessment plan was piloted. Per plan, the instructors whose GE courses were sampled for GE assessment summaries and interpret the results. The summary is then forwarded to the GE committee of the Academic Senate which comprise faculty. Working with the Director of Undergraduate Studies & General Education and the Director of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness, the GE committee interprets the findings aggregated across faculty and courses, whenever possible, as indicators of the quality of the GE program.

Assessment results are reviewed by program faculty in a micro/macro relationship, i.e., an individual class in relationship to the overall curriculum structure, and how curriculum content within one area is cross-pollinated into other areas for greater breadth.

### Arts, B.F.A.

| YES |
| Compliance Assist; GE website; Catalog |

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions. 

Assessment results are reviewed by program faculty in a micro/macro relationship, i.e., an individual class in relationship to the overall curriculum structure, and how curriculum content within one area is cross-pollinated into other areas for greater breadth.

### Arts, M.A.

| YES |
| Compliance Assist; GE website; Catalog |

Embedded course assignment(s); Faculty approved independent study projects; Internships; Portfolio review 

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions. 

Assessment results are reviewed by program faculty in a micro/macro relationship, i.e., an individual class in relationship to the overall curriculum structure, and how curriculum content within one area is cross-pollinated into other areas for greater breadth.

### Arts, M.F.A.

| YES |
| Compliance Assist; GE website; Catalog |

Culmination project (thesis/exhibit/project/eposive); Formal post point benchmark review 

Individual faculty members responsible for graduate studies within their concentration areas typically conduct the formal benchmark review. Graduate students' committee chair and graduate coordinator perform a comprehensive review of the capstone project. Program faculty collectively review the assessment results to determine improvement actions.

Assessment findings indicate that the program needs a greater number of 500-level courses designed solely for graduate students. Currently, most graduate coursework is taught at the same time and place as undergraduate courses (stack classes). These combination courses do not serve the graduate student's needs as they dilute the depth and breath within the graduate program experience. The Arts Department is in the initial planning stage to create a stand-alone graduate art history courses, as well as special topic coursework for each area so that professors can garner release time from undergraduate duties and rotate into the individual area's graduate program.

### Dance, B.A.

| YES |
| Compliance Assist; GE website; Catalog |

Preliminary performance review; Critical assessment (written form of the embedded course outcome); "Hands-on" evaluation; Final exam; Research paper; Tracking of alumni achievement 

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

1) Assessment findings reinforced dance faculty's dedication to classical characteristics in dance training content, the "hands-on" approach to mentoring student development with one-on-one feedback, in-class personal written and/or oral feedback with each performance project, and end of year meetings between faculty and students to discuss the results of panel assessments. 2) Goals and pedagogical improvements were made to include: working with the faculty to conduct a session on dancer efficiency; scheduling a ballet open studio time to address individual student needs; developing a rotation of the faculty teaching the four levels of Modern Dance using video technology in the classroom to allow the students to self-assess their areas of strength and weakness.

### Civil Engineering, M.S.

| YES |
| O&AEE website [PFR document]; CSUF website; Catalog |

Exams; Course embedded assignment; Class participation; Project group projects; Final graduate project report/thesis 

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

Assessment findings have led to improvements and changes at both the individual course and curriculum levels; changes in individual courses were made for upcoming class sessions as informed by previous student assessment findings, and new and special course offerings were proposed when the findings suggested an area of Civil Engineering specialty not covered by the current curriculum.
The student satisfaction survey results indicated high overall ratings in the area of “your experiences with professors.” In general, students indicated that they are satisfied with their professors, consider their professors knowledgeable, and believe that their professors are serious about student learning. In the area of “your experiences in the program,” the highest rating was given to “the course content is up-to-date,” while students in general were not satisfied with the availability of a variety of courses. Another question that received a low rating is “I know where to ask for help when I need help,” in the area of the environment. The results of the student survey were reviewed by the program faculty, and improvement actions are in development.

Psychology, M.A.

Coursework, Capstone practice/research projects; Presentations; Student satisfaction survey

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

The assessment findings confirmed successful achievement of the department goals, and student learning outcomes. Current successful practices will be continued. The goals and SLOs will continue to be assessed to monitor program effectiveness.

Criminal Justice, B.A.

Courseembedded assignment; Exams; Presentations; Final and short essays; Alumni survey; Employer survey

The Assessment Committee of the Department, composed of three elected faculty members, collects the assessment data from constituencies for review. The constituencies include faculty, Industrial Advisory Board, alumni and their employers, and colleagues in other universities. Suggested revisions are presented to the faculty, Industrial Advisory Board, and student club’s officers. If the feedback for the revisions is favorable, the faculty will approve and implement them.

The department’s Assessment Committee holds a faculty retreat each semester to present assessment results, moderate discussion on ways in which the department can “close the loop,” and provide workshops that address areas identified as particularly challenging to students. As a result of feedback from the assessment cycle, the Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee work jointly to integrate findings and feedback from the assessment cycle with the curriculum review and development process and to modify the curriculum of courses in which the assessment occurs. As part of the 2012-2013 cycle, for example, the Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee worked together to incorporate feedback on the learning objectives identified in the assessment process.

The findings confirmed that in general the curriculum is adequate in addressing the assessed SLOs. Areas of improvement identified by the findings include: 1) courses generally do not specifically speak to the economic dimensions of crime; 2) students are not getting any specialized research training; 3) many students find that they lack experience in working with the courts; 4) more class times for courses such as CJ 340 (CJ Research Methods) are desired; 5) more student support, changed some assessment measures, and modified some student learning outcomes. For example, the Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee worked together to incorporate feedback on the learning objectives identified in the assessment process.

The findings confirmed that the curriculum is adequate in addressing the assessed SLOs. Assessment findings from individual courses were utilized to make changes in corresponding courses. For example, one finding was to change the prerequisites for certain research courses. Previously, students were allowed to take statistics and research methods concurrently, or research methods and an experimental lab. However, the feedback raised the issue that students who had not completed more basic courses did not learn adequately in the later classes. Hence, course prerequisites were changed to prohibit concurrent enrollment in courses, instead requiring students to take courses in a sequence that maximizes their ability to learn.

Math, B.A.

Research paper/project; Courseembedded assignment; Internship-based journal entries; problem-solving exercises; online issues; statistics homework

Faculty assess actual learning products from undergraduates in psychology classes which rate the extent to which the learning outcomes have been achieved by each student. Feedback is given to the Department Chair and Curriculum Committee for review. The assessment activities are linked with the curriculum review process in which the department has a 5-year cycle for reviewing all courses. The review process dictates that courses must explicitly address student learning outcomes in their syllabi and assignments. In addition, feedback from the assessment cycle is used to modify the curriculum of courses in which the assessment occurs.

The findings confirmed that the curriculum is adequate in addressing the assessed SLOs. Assessment findings from individual courses were utilized to make changes in corresponding courses. For example, one finding was to change the prerequisites for certain research courses. Previously, students were allowed to take statistics and research methods concurrently, or research methods and an experimental lab. However, the feedback raised the issue that students who had not completed more basic courses did not learn adequately in the later classes. Course prerequisites were changed to prohibit concurrent enrollment in courses, instead requiring students to take courses in a sequence that maximizes their ability to learn.

Psychology, M.A.

The thesis chair and two committee members review the master’s thesis and performance of students. Performance of students is evaluated based on their thesis performance, the learning outcomes related to research design, statistics, and writing.

The Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee work jointly to integrate feedback and findings from the assessment cycle with the curriculum review and development process and to modify the curriculum of courses in which the assessment occurs. As part of the department’s curriculum review, existing and new courses are required to specify which learning outcomes students will master and how the assignments of the class will demonstrate mastery.
In the P.S. program, assessment of student learning occurs formally after the first semester. Faculty for the core three P.S. classes rate students in five areas that are tied to one or more learning outcomes: and communication/interaction participation; written communication; knowledge of subject; readiness for clinical work; and readiness for thesis work. In the fieldwork classes (PSYC 594 A-B), faculty review video recordings of students’ work with clients. The thesis chair and two committee members review the master’s thesis and perform a thorough assessment of students’ achievement of learning outcomes related to research design, statistics, and writing.

The Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee work jointly to integrate findings and feedback from the assessment cycle with the curriculum review and development process and to modify the curriculum of courses in which the assessment occurs. As part of the department’s curriculum review, existing and new courses are required to specify which learning outcomes students will master and how the assignments of the class will demonstrate each mastery.

Assessment of student learning in the core coursework is used for making judgments about students’ readiness to continue toward internship in their second year. Occasionally, the faculty decide that students are not prepared for internship and must wait until their third year to complete an internship in order to give them an extra year to enhance their learning or to mature. On rare occasions, these evaluations may lead P.S. faculty to decide that students are not suited to becoming professional clinicians, and students will be asked to leave the program. All students receive formal evaluation letters in person from the P.S. coordinator at the beginning of their second semester in which the student and the coordinator discuss strengths and weaknesses and what must be done to ensure continued progress through the program.

Assessment of student learning in the fieldwork classes enables faculty to direct the immediate assessment of students’ abilities to implement several learning outcomes. In addition, faculty use student performance to alter the content of earlier classes to better prepare students for internship. For example, the same faculty member teaches PSYC 594B and PSYC 547, and uses observations of student performance in 594B to modify its 547 course content to prepare students for internship and to enhance their accomplishment of program learning outcomes.
Electrical Engineering, B.S.
Computer Science, B.S.
Computer Engineering, B.S.
Music, B.M.
Music, B.A.
Communication Studies, B.A.
Geology, M.S.

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

OAEE website (PPR Document); Department website; Catalog
Compliance Assist; OAEE website; Department website; Catalog
OAEE website (PPR Document); Department website; Catalog
Department website (links to Compliance Assist; OAEE website; Department website; Catalog)
Department website; Catalog
OAEE website (PPR Document); Department website; Catalog
OAEE website (PPR Document); Department website; Catalog

Capstone experiences; Comprehensive Exam; M.A. thesis
Alumni surveys; Employer surveys
evaluations of student performance; Portfolios; Exit survey;
Signature assignment including counseling session transcripts; Written paper and reflection essay; Clinical practice supervisor evaluations of student performance; Portfolio; Exit survey; Alumni surveys; Employer surveys
Program faculty review and submit assessment results and areas of strength or weakness in student performance to the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee then reviews these reports and sends a summary with recommendations to the department.
The findings confirmed exiting practices and also led to the following actions: 1) an increased effort to reach student areas of interest with the academic faculty. 2) Improved student engagement by fostering meaningful dialog with students in group settings. 3) Improved professional development opportunities for faculty. The Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC), composed of three graduate SLOs to three specific goals, entered those into Compliance Assist, and updated all M.A. reading lists.

The assessment findings confirmed, in general, the effectiveness of the current curriculum. Specific courses that need further review and updates are listed below:

1. EGME 100: The course should be revised to better prepare students for upper-level courses. 2. EGME 230: The course should be revised to include more practical applications. 3. EGME 380: The course should be revised to include more real-world examples. 4. EGME 419: The course should be revised to include more hands-on projects. 5. EGME 490: The course should be revised to include more computational tools.

The assessment findings confirmed, in general, the effectiveness of the current curriculum. Specific courses that need further review and updates are listed below:

1. EGME 100: The course should be revised to better prepare students for upper-level courses. 2. EGME 230: The course should be revised to include more practical applications. 3. EGME 380: The course should be revised to include more real-world examples. 4. EGME 419: The course should be revised to include more hands-on projects. 5. EGME 490: The course should be revised to include more computational tools.

The assessment findings confirmed, in general, the effectiveness of the current curriculum. Specific courses that need further review and updates are listed below:

1. EGME 100: The course should be revised to better prepare students for upper-level courses. 2. EGME 230: The course should be revised to include more practical applications. 3. EGME 380: The course should be revised to include more real-world examples. 4. EGME 419: The course should be revised to include more hands-on projects. 5. EGME 490: The course should be revised to include more computational tools.

The assessment findings confirmed, in general, the effectiveness of the current curriculum. Specific courses that need further review and updates are listed below:

1. EGME 100: The course should be revised to better prepare students for upper-level courses. 2. EGME 230: The course should be revised to include more practical applications. 3. EGME 380: The course should be revised to include more real-world examples. 4. EGME 419: The course should be revised to include more hands-on projects. 5. EGME 490: The course should be revised to include more computational tools.

The assessment findings confirmed, in general, the effectiveness of the current curriculum. Specific courses that need further review and updates are listed below:

1. EGME 100: The course should be revised to better prepare students for upper-level courses. 2. EGME 230: The course should be revised to include more practical applications. 3. EGME 380: The course should be revised to include more real-world examples. 4. EGME 419: The course should be revised to include more hands-on projects. 5. EGME 490: The course should be revised to include more computational tools.
Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

1) The findings suggested the need to clarify the SLOs. 2) An oral communication rubric was developed to accurately evaluate student oral presentations. 3) Based on the assessment of writing skills, written assignments are now required for all courses (not just GE). In addition, the writing rubric was updated. Further, in spring 2013, new writing clinics were held that were well received by the students enrolled in applicable courses. Based on assessment of, "engaging in social justice practices in communities," the department has decided to embed this assessment more thoughtfully in one of the service-learning courses. In addition, the program is currently working on defining what "social justice practices" are and how students will best benefit from them. In 2013-2014, the program obtained the assistance of a temporary faculty member to support CHIC assessment.

2014-2015

Geography, B.A.

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

The findings led to the following actions: 1) Students in GEO 281 will be required to meet with the instructor prior to the deadline of the final project to check on their progress; 2) Increase the number and frequency of applied and geotechnical classes, including Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and especially Remote Sensing.

2014-2015

Geography, M.A.

Program faculty review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

The findings would be evaluated to see if the graduate curriculum is adequate in addressing the assessed SLOs.

2014-2015

Physics, B.S.

Program faculty and the Assessment Committee review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

The findings confirmed that the curriculum, in general, is adequate in addressing the assessed SLOs. One weakness observed is students' ability to correctly use technical language in oral presentations. The faculty are in the process of discussing ways to address this weakness.

2014-2015

Physics, Ph.D.

Program faculty and the Assessment Committee review the assessment results and determine improvement actions.

The initial assessment of Ph.D. SLOs is being conducted in the 2015-16 school year. The assessment committee will determine potential improvement actions and then discuss with the entire faculty.