Guidelines for the Revised Faculty Accreditation Report
(i.e. Program Assessment Plan)
Due Date: April 14, 2010

Context & Purpose: As part of the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER), UC Merced will evaluate how well our campus conducts assessment across the institution as a means to identify our strengths and our resource needs. Importantly, UC Merced must show how the results of program assessment are being used to improve student learning *and* to refine assessment practices. The PLO Assessment Report submitted in January 2010 provided evidence of the former. For the latter, each program is asked to update its 2009 Faculty Accreditation Report in response to what has been learned about assessment during the intervening year. To identify future goals for improvement, each program is also asked to self-assess the quality of its learning outcomes and assessment planning using the WASC *Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes*. Aggregate summaries of these self-assessments will be included in university's EER report submitted in December 2010. **It is important to note that this request for an updated assessment plan is specific to completing the Educational Effectiveness Review Report. It will not be an annual requirement in the future.**

Submission: Please submit a revised Faculty Accreditation Report ***and*** Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators that attend to items I-IV below **by April 14, 2010**. Specific submission information will follow.

Support: If you have questions about any aspect of these guidelines or would like advice or feedback on proposed revisions, please contact the staff member from the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence who has been assigned to support your program's assessment efforts. (See appended list.) To support the revision process, several resources are also appended including:

- The original Faculty Accreditation Report Outline;
- The WASC *Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes*;
- An example of a program's self-evaluation based on the aforementioned WASC PLO rubric, generously provided by the Psychology program.

I. Summary of Assessment Plan Revisions

Please add to your revised Faculty Accreditation Report a brief abstract describing the updates made to the program's assessment plan.

II. Update Faculty Accreditation Report submitted in January 2009

<u>Overall Report</u>: The goal is to review and update the program's original assessment plan submitted in January 2009[1] based on:

- the findings reported in the January 2010 Program Learning Outcome Assessment Report;
- increased familiarity with assessment goals and processes;
- changes to the program;
- self-evaluation against the appended *Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes*

[1] The assessment plan is Section II of the Faculty Accreditation Report submitted in January 2009.

Revisions to the FAO report might include adjustments to time-line or scope of assessment methods, the types of evidence used, revisions to program learning outcomes or the order in which they will be examined, etc. Please site the evidence, or in the absence of evidence, the experiences or rationale, supporting these decisions. Since this document is written to guide your program's assessment work, please write it with your colleagues and the development of your program in mind.

Curriculum Maps:

A. Please briefly revise Section III, Part A of your Faculty Accreditation Report, if:

- it previously did *not* include a curriculum map summarizing the alignment between the Program Learning Outcomes and the Eight Guiding Principles;
- your program has revised one or more of its PLOs;
- your program has other reasons for revising Section III, Part A of your Faculty Accreditation Report.

A template curriculum map and a list of the Eight Guiding Principles are appended. *Please also* briefly explain how your program contributes to student engagement with the Eight Guiding Principles as described by its PLOs and summarized in the curriculum map.

B. Now that syllabi for most courses contain learning outcomes, it would be worthwhile to revisit the Curriculum Map (Section III, Part C of appended Faculty Accreditation Report Outline) to verify the alignment between course and program learning outcomes (i.e. which courses support which PLOs) and to update the anticipated levels of learning (i.e. introductory, developed, mastery).

Please also add to this section of the report a brief summary of the rationale for these updates. For example, perhaps the learning outcomes of a lower division course have been updated to include an introduction to research methods in order to improve student learning with respect to a PLO.

III. Self-Evaluation Using the WASC Rubric

Please add a "Part G" to Section II of the revised Faculty Accreditation Report that briefly summarizes the program's self-assessment of its assessment plan against the WASC *Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes*.

For each of the rubric's five criteria[2], please rate the level of development of your program (Initial, Emerging, etc.), briefly explain this rating, and for ratings other than Highly Developed, briefly (in a sentence or two) note any plans for improvement. Psychology's self-evaluation is appended as an example.

IV. Revised Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

WASC requires that an updated Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators be submitted with the Educational Effectiveness Review Report. As with the CPR Report, this table summarizes key aspects of each program's assessment plan. Please update and submit this Inventory with your revised Faculty Accreditation Report. In the case you do not have access to the program's original Inventory, an Excel template is attached to the accompanying email. Alternatively, please contact Laura Martin, lmartin@ucmerced.edu, for a copy of the original Inventory.

---

[2] The criteria are comprehensive list, assessable outcomes, alignment, assessment planning, and the student experience.

Appendix: FAO Staff Support Listings

School of Engineering

Program	FAO	CRTE & IPA Support Staff
Bioengineering	Ariel Escobar	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner
Environmental Engineering	Tom Harmon	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner
Computer Science & Engineering	Ming-Hsuan Yang	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Materials Science & Engineering	Christopher Viney	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner
Mechanical Engineering	Carlos Coimbra	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner

School of Natural Sciences

Program	FAO	CRTE & IPA Support Staff
Applied Mathematics	Arnold Kim	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner
Biological Sciences	Patti LiWang	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner
Chemical Sciences	Anne Kelley	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner
Earth Systems Science	Lara Kueppers	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner
Physics	Kevin Mitchell	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner
NSED Minor	Arnold Kim	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner

School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

Program	FAO	CRTE & IPA Support Staff
Anthropology	Kathleen Hull	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Political Science	Tom Hansford	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Psychology	Will Shadish	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Cognitive Science	Jeff Yoshimi	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Economics	Shawn Kantor	Pending

Program	FAO	CRTE & IPA Support Staff
History	Sholeh Quinn	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Literatures & Cultures	Gregg Camfield	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Management	Hans Bjornsson	Robert Ochsner & Nancy Ochsner
American Studies Minor	Gregg Camfield	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Arts Minor • Media Arts • GASP	Dunya Ramicova Kevin Fellezs	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Philosophy Minor	Peter Vandershraaf	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Sociology Minor	Irenee Beattie	Karen Dunn-Haley & Mike Roona
Writing Minor	Anne Zanzucchi	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner
Service Science Minor	Hans Bjornsson	Robert Ochnser & Nancy Ochsner
Spanish Minor	Virginia Adan-Lifante	Robert Ochsner & Mike Roona
Core 1	Tom Hothem	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner
Core 100	Anne Zanzucchi & Tom Hothem	Anne Zanzucchi & Nancy Ochsner

Graduate Programs

Program	FAO	CRTE & IPA Support Staff
Environmental Systems	Tom Harmon	Laura Martin & Nancy Ochsner

Faculty Accreditation Report – Due 30 January 2009
Outline

Dear FAO,

This document outlines in more detail the narrative summary of the assessment plan *due January 30, 2009*. As you will see in Section II below, it also highlights connections between the assessment plan and the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (an excel file), a required WASC exhibit also due January 30th.

For detailed information regarding FAO responsibilities including a timeline, please see the *FAO Activities and Schedule* handout. Copies of this document as well as the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators can be found at http://crte.ucmerced.edu/program-learning-outcomes-resources under Resources for Faculty Accreditation Organizers. If you have any questions, please contact Laura Martin at lmartin@ucmerced.edu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (page 1 double spaced)

SECTION I: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION - MAJOR AND/OR MINOR (1-3 pages double spaced)

Description of Program

How does your program reflect current or emerging trends in your respective field? What is distinctive about your program? Do students collaborate on research projects or engage in other distinctive learning experiences? How does your program prepare your graduates for further educational and/or professional development? [1]

SECTION II: ASSESSMENT PLAN – MAJOR AND/OR MINOR (3-9 pages double spaced)

Part A: Timeline & Goals

In general, what is your timeline and what are your goals for your assessment plan?

Part B: Outline of PLOs

Please outline your Program Learning Outcomes. Where will they be published or otherwise communicated to students and other stakeholders and by when? (See Question 2 of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.)

Part C: Evidence

For each PLO, what kind of direct (student work) and indirect evidence (ex. surveys, focus groups) will be gathered and examined? How will data be analyzed? How will findings be used to improve student learning? (See Questions 3 & 5 of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.)

Part D: Process

How and when will assessment for student achievement of each PLO occur? Please outline a brief plan for each year.

---

[1] If the program offers a minor that is a reduced version of your major, please briefly describe the relationship between the minor and major. If your program offers a minor with no relationship to a major, please simply complete all elements of this report with respect to that minor degree.

Part E: Participants

Who will participate in implementing your assessment plan including evidence collection, data analysis, dissemination of results, and implementation of findings to improve student learning? (See Question 4 of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.)

Part F: Minor

If your program involves a minor that is a reduced version of the major, please describe the learning achievements expected of the minor and how the program will assess this learning.

SECTION III: ALIGNMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM GOALS/OUTCOMES – MAJOR AND/OR MINOR (~ 3 pages double spaced)

Part A: Program and Institutional Goals/Outcomes

In what ways does your program reflect institution-wide goals? For context, please consider UC Merced's Eight Guiding Principles of General Education, and / or UC Merced's Mission Statement[2] that identifies our campus as a "student-centered research university." [3]

Part B: Program & School Goals (as applicable)

How does your program complement your School's identity and learning goals?

Part C: Program & Course (Student) Learning Outcomes

How does your curriculum support your Program Learning Outcomes?[4]

---

[2] Appendices A and B of this document, respectively.

[3] A table illustrating the relationship between a program's PLOs and the 8 guiding principles is a useful tool for illustrating this relationship.

[4] A curriculum map is a useful way to visually represent this relationship. For an example, see the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence website http://crte.ucmerced.edu/program-learning-outcomes-resources.

APPENDIX A: Eight Guiding Principles of General Education

Scientific Literacy: To have a functional understanding of scientific, technological and quantitative information, and to know both how to interpret scientific information and effectively apply quantitative tools;

Decision Making: To appreciate the various and diverse factors bearing on decisions and the know-how to assemble, evaluate, interpret and use information effectively for critical analysis and problem solving;

Communication: To convey information to and communicate and interact effectively with multiple audiences, using advanced skills in written and other modes of communication;

Self and Society: To understand and value diverse perspective in both the global community contexts of modern society in order to work knowledgeably and effectively in an ethnically and culturally rich setting;

Ethics and Responsibility: To follow ethical practices in their professions and communities, and care for future generations through sustainable living and environmental and societal responsibility;

Leadership and Teamwork: To work effectively in both leadership and team roles, capably making connections and integrating their expertise with the expertise of others;

Aesthetic Understanding Creativity: to appreciate and be knowledgeable about human creative expression, including literature and the arts; and

Development of Personal Potential: To be responsible for achieving the full promise of their abilities, including psychological and physical well-being.

APPENDIX B: UC Merced Mission

UC Merced Mission Statement—November 2005

The University of California, Merced's mission is embodied in its proud claim of being the first American research university of the twenty-first century. As the tenth campus of the University of California, UC Merced will achieve excellence in carrying out the University's mission of teaching, research and service, benefiting society through discovering and transmitting new knowledge and functioning as an active repository of
organized knowledge. As a key tenet in carrying out this mission, UC Merced promotes and celebrates the diversity of all members of its community.

A research university is a community bound by learning, discovery and engagement. As the first American student-centered research university of the twenty-first century, UC Merced's strong graduate and research programs will mesh with high quality undergraduate programs. New knowledge increasingly depends on links among the disciplines, working together on questions that transcend the traditional disciplines. UC
Merced fosters and encourages cross-disciplinary inquiry and discovery.

Interdisciplinary practice in research will nourish undergraduate learning, building a foundation in connecting the ways that academic disciplines understand and grapple with society's problems. Undergraduates will experience education inside and outside the classroom, applying what they learn through undergraduate research, service learning and leadership development. As apprentice scholars, graduate students will build their understanding of and ability to do independent research in their chosen field, as the groundwork for entering professional life. Lifelong learners will continue to hone their knowledge and workplace skills.

The twenty-first century has opened with the promise of new ways of connecting people to new knowledge and to one another. UC Merced opens as a network, not simply a single place, linking its students, faculty and staff to the educational resources of the state, nation and world. The idea of network extends to UC Merced's relationships with neighboring institutions: educational, cultural and social. Born as a member of the distinguished network known as the University of California, UC Merced seeks strong and mutually supportive relationships with a variety of collaborators in its region: public and private colleges and universities; federal and state organizations that share UC Merced's educational and research goals; and cultural and social institutions.

The idea of network will also be realized through the physical and intellectual integration between UC Merced and its surrounding community. The campus is planned as a model of physical sustainability for the twenty-first century, inviting all members of the campus and surrounding community to think and act as good stewards of the environment that they will convey to future generations.

UC Merced celebrates its location in the San Joaquin Valley, reflecting the poetry of its landscape, history, resources and diverse cultures, while capitalizing on and expanding the Valley's connections to the emerging global society. UC Merced recognizes that research that begins with the natural laboratory at home can extend what is known in the state, nation and world.

APPENDIX C: Link to Center for Research on Teaching Excellence resources on Program Learning Outcomes

http://crte.ucmerced.edu/program-learning-outcomes-resources

WASC

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Comprehensive List	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. 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. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. 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 (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome.
Assessable Outcomes	Outcome statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Statements such as "Students understand scientific method" do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., "Graduates can write reports in APA style" or "Graduates can make original contributions to biological knowledge."	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, such as rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.
Alignment	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.	Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.
Assessment Planning	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
The Student Experience	Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere.	Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcomes and levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.

How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Learning Outcomes Rubric

Conclusions should be based on a review of learning outcomes and assessment plans. Although you can make some preliminary judgments about alignment based on examining the curriculum or a curriculum map, you will have to interview key departmental representatives, such as department chairs, faculty, and students, to fully evaluate the alignment of the learning environment with the outcomes.

The rubric has five major dimensions:

1. **Comprehensive List**. The set of program learning outcomes should be a short but comprehensive list of the most important knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program, including relevant institution-wide outcomes such as those dealing with communication skills, critical thinking, or information literacy. Faculty generally should expect higher levels of sophistication for graduate programs than for undergraduate programs, and they should consider national disciplinary standards when developing and refining their outcomes, if available. There is no strict rule concerning the optimum number of outcomes, but quality is more important than quantity. Faculty should not confuse learning processes (e.g., completing an internship) with learning outcomes (what is learned in the internship, such as application of theory to real-world practice). Questions. Is the list reasonable, appropriate and well-organized? Are relevant institution-wide outcomes, such as information literacy, included? Are distinctions between undergraduate and graduate outcomes clear? Have national disciplinary standards been considered when developing and refining the outcomes? Are explicit criteria – as defined in a rubric, for example – available for each outcome?
2. **Assessable Outcomes**. Outcome statements should specify what students can do to demonstrate their learning. For example, an outcome might state that "Graduates of our program can collaborate effectively to reach a common goal" or that "Graduates of our program can design research studies to test theories and examine issues relevant to our discipline." These outcomes are assessable because faculty can observe the quality of collaboration in teams, and they can review the quality of student-created research designs. Criteria for assessing student products or behaviors usually are specified in rubrics, and the department should develop examples of varying levels of student performance (i.e., work that does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations) to illustrate levels. Questions. Do the outcomes clarify how students can demonstrate learning? Have the faculty agreed on explicit criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing each outcome? Do they have examples of work representing different levels of mastery for each outcome?
3. **Alignment**. Students cannot be held responsible for mastering learning outcomes unless they have participated in a program that systematically supports their development. The curriculum should be explicitly designed to provide opportunities for students to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design often is summarized in a curriculum map—a matrix that shows the relationship between courses in the required curriculum and the program's learning outcomes. Pedagogy and grading should be aligned with outcomes to foster and encourage student growth and to provide students helpful feedback on their development. Since learning occurs within and outside the classroom, relevant student services (e.g., advising and tutoring centers) and co-curriculum (e.g., student clubs and campus events) should be designed to support the outcomes. Questions. Is the curriculum explicitly aligned with the program outcomes? Do faculty select effective pedagogy and use grading to promote learning? Are student support services and the co-curriculum explicitly aligned to promote student development of the learning outcomes?
4. **Assessment Planning**. Faculty should develop explicit plans for assessing each outcome. Programs need not assess every outcome every year, but faculty should have a plan to cycle through the outcomes over a reasonable period of time, such as the period for program review cycles. Questions. Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time? Is the plan sustainable, in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Are assessment plans revised, as needed?
5. **The Student Experience**. At a minimum, students should be aware of the learning outcomes of the program(s) in which they are enrolled; ideally, they should be included as partners in defining and applying the outcomes and the criteria for levels of sophistication. Thus it is essential to communicate learning outcomes to students consistently and meaningfully. Questions: Are the outcomes communicated to students? Do students understand what the outcomes mean and how they can further their own learning? Do students use the outcomes and criteria to self-assess? Do they participate in reviews of outcomes, criteria, curriculum design, or related activities?

Dear FAOs,

Please find on the following page a template for a curriculum map to visually represent the alignment of Program's Learning Outcomes (PLOs) with the Eight Guiding Principles of General Education. A review of these relationships is requested in Section III, Part A of the Faculty Accreditation Report Outline.

Often, such maps facilitate insight into curriculum in ways that are more efficient than narrative alone. For example, by visually illustrating how educational efforts are distributed with respect to intended student learning outcomes, they can help identify useful points for engaging with the curriculum.

Please note that this table is meant to summarize, rather than completely replace, your program's reflections on the contributions it makes to student engagement with the Eight Guiding Principles.

If you elect to use this template, please number your PLOs. Enter these numbers in the far left column under PLO. Then use an X, or symbol of your choice, to indicate that a given PLO supports student achievement of a given Guiding Principle.

Finally, replace the red X's in the table's heading with the relevant information (table number and name of your program).

Eight Guiding Principles of General Education

Scientific Literacy: To have a functional understanding of scientific, technological and quantitative information, and to know both how to interpret scientific information and effectively apply quantitative tools;

Decision Making: To appreciate the various and diverse factors bearing on decisions and the know-how to assemble, evaluate, interpret and use information effectively for critical analysis and problem solving;

Communication: To convey information to and communicate and interact effectively with multiple audiences, using advanced skills in written and other modes of communication;

Self and Society: To understand and value diverse perspective in both the global community contexts of modern society in order to work knowledgeably and effectively in an ethnically and culturally rich setting;

Ethics and Responsibility: To follow ethical practices in their professions and communities, and care for future generations through sustainable living and environmental and societal responsibility;

Leadership and Teamwork: To work effectively in both leadership and team roles, capably making connections and integrating their expertise with the expertise of others;

Aesthetic Understanding Creativity: to appreciate and be knowledgeable about human creative expression, including literature and the arts; and

Development of Personal Potential: To be responsible for achieving the full promise of their abilities, including psychological and physical well-being.

Table **X**: A curriculum map representing the alignment between **XXXXX** Program Learning Outcomes and the Eight Guiding Principles of General Education.

PLOs	Scientific Literacy	Decision Making	Communication	Self & Society	Ethics & Responsibility	Leadership & Teamwork	Aesthetic Understanding Creativity	Development of Personal Potential

PSYCHOLOGY'S SELF-EVALUATION USING WASC RUBRIC

Part A. Comprehensive List

The Psychology PLOs are probably best described as "Developed" in the WASC rubric. The Faculty Accreditation Report submitted by Psychology on January 30, 2009, made clear its consideration of both institution-wide outcomes and national disciplinary standards. The PLOs fall short of a "Highly Developed" rating because they probably do not meet the standard for such a rating that says "Faculty have agreed upon explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome." However, it is unlikely the faculty could take this step until the methods for assessing each PLO have been finalized.

Part B. Assessable Outcomes

The Psychology PLOs are probably at the "Emerging" level. The faculty needs to provide more information to students about how they can demonstrate learning. Some PLOs already do this (probably PLO#3), but others do not.

Part C. Alignment

The Psychology PLOs are probably at the "Developed" level. The curriculum provides ample opportunity for students to learn and develop the skills described in the PLOs, and a curriculum map outlines the relationship between the PLOs and the curriculum. However, the map does not clearly articulate increasing levels of proficiency in the PLOs, specifically lacking a mastery course such as a capstone course. This omission was intentional. With a faculty of 6 and with 320 majors, the faculty were unable to develop such a mastery course given the resources that would be required to grade in that course. The faculty should, however, continue to consider ways to in which a mastery requirement could be introduced into the curriculum.

Part D. Assessment Planning

The Psychology PLOs are probably at the "Emerging" level. While assessment plans are specified for PLO#1 and #2, the faculty have not yet agreed on how PLO#3 might be assessed. Further, the current assessment plan (e.g., the ETS major field test) is clearly tentative, and may change over time as the faculty gains experience with present options and alternatives.

Part E. The Student Experience

The Psychology PLOs are probably at the "Emerging" level. PLOs have been published in the UC Merced catalog in the Psychology major section, they are published on the UC Merced Psychological Sciences web site (http://psychology.ucmerced.edu), and are occasionally presented in the syllabi of individual instructors. The faculty should develop additional ways of ensuring student awareness of the PLOs, and see that the PLOs are incorporated into all syllabi. Students have had limited involvement in the creation and use of rubrics or in self-assessment. However, it may be premature to involve students until the assessment plan itself is further developed.