



---

Discovery. Diversity. Distinction.

# Kremen School of Education and Human Development

Program Assessment Reports  
2015-2016

**Kremen School of Education and Human Development  
Program Assessment Reports  
Table of Contents**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT).....                                      | 3  |
| 2. Master of Arts in Education – Curriculum and Instruction.....              | 11 |
| 3. Master of Arts in Education – Educational Leadership & Administration..... | 21 |
| 4. Master of Science in Counseling.....                                       | 31 |
| 5. Master of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling.....                        | 39 |
| 6. Master of Arts in Education – Reading/Language Arts.....                   | 43 |
| 7. Master of Arts in Special Education.....                                   | 47 |
| 8. Master of Arts in Education – Early Childhood Education.....               | 66 |
| 9. Master of Arts in Education – Multilingual Multicultural.....              | 70 |
| 10. Liberal Studies.....  | 78 |
| 11. Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.....                           | 83 |

## Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)

Dr. Walter J. Ullrich, Coordinator

### LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

---

The overarching goal of the online Master of Arts in Teaching is to prepare candidates to become inclusive teachers and critically reflective, equity-oriented educators who are familiar with multiple ways of framing issues and concerns related to teaching, skilled in using action research to inform and improve their own practice, and strong in communicating with a wide variety of constituencies, including those who speak a language other than English. Consequently, the program contributes directly to the needs of our democratic schools and society.

Consistent with the mission and vision of CSU Fresno and the KSOEHD, the online MAT developed, tested, and assessed a **new** set of learning outcomes delineated below beginning fall 2012. The program's core courses as well as assessment components have been **re**-constructed around these **new** seven learning outcomes.

Specific Learning Outcomes assessed during 2015/16 for both Cohort 10 (who began the program fall 2014 and graduated fall 2015) and Cohort 11 (who began the program fall 2015 and will graduate this fall 2016) are identified below with an asterisk (\*). Each learning outcome section concludes by succinctly identifying the instruments used, findings with respect to learning outcomes assessed, and changes made in the program based on these data. In short, this Annual Assessment Report on the online MAT integrates the first five questions from the assessment guidelines/template, namely:

1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?
2. What instruments did you use to assess them?
3. What did you discover from these data?
4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?
5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-17 academic year?

Before beginning the 2015/2016 Annual Report, a few caveats are in order: First, new MAT faculty -- Dr. Nancy Akhavan (ERE 243) and Dr. David Low -- began their prominent role as lead faculty in the program's research strand last fall 2015 (Akhavan) and spring 2016 (Low). Despite being new to the program, Dr. Akhavan received a QOLT (Quality Online Learning and Teaching) Award from TILT/CSALT during their review process of ERE 243 with MAT Cohort 10 spring, 2015. MAT Coordinator, Dr. Walter J. Ullrich (CI 260), also received a QOLT Award for CI 260 fall, 2014 for his work with MAT Cohort 9. Because of these successes, Dr. Akhavan offered ERE 243 to the new Cohort 11 and Dr. Ullrich offer CI 260 to the graduating Cohort 10 in the DISCOVERYe Tablet Program fall 2015. Second, MAT Cohort 10 graduate Sarah Haskett was nominated for the KSOEHD's Outstanding Project Award and Alexandria Aiello received program awards for their action research projects, consistent with reaching the Mastery level in the action research-based outcomes identified below. Third, all MAT Cohort 10 passed their Comprehensive Examination fall 2015, consistent with reaching the Mastery level on all 7 learning outcomes identified below. Finally, and perhaps most important, the online MAT was rated as the #14 best online master's degree program in the US by BestColleges.com <http://www.bestcolleges.com/features/best-online-masters-education-programs/>

**\*(1) Critical Questioner (CQ):** CI240 (Fall, 2015), **ENTRY LEVEL**; CI241, (Spring, 2016),

**INTERMEDIATE LEVEL; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), MASTERY**

Students will express a critical, questioning perspective (i.e., identify, describe, and analyze) about diverse theoretical paradigms about teaching, learning and school reform, including those generated by marginalized groups, which situate schooling in a larger historic and political context.

This means that:

- Students use broad undergirding epistemological perspectives (i.e., positivism, phenomenology, narrative, emancipatory knowledge) to critically interpret what people say about teaching, learning, and school reform.
- Students compare and contrast "mainstream" perspectives about teaching and learning with those generated by members of marginalized groups.
- Students use their own personal and professional experience as a foundation to articulate their own perspectives about teaching and learning issues.
- Students situate (identify, place, and interpret) specific school issues in larger sociological contexts defined by complex historical and contemporary relations of race, ethnicity, language, social class, and gender.

The CQ outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. CI 240 was refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) by a veteran faculty Dr. Melanie Wenrick to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was refined by Dr. Walter J. Ullrich before spring 2016 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246 and CI 260 were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) by veteran faculty Dr. Chris Foster and Dr. Walter Ullrich respectively to help students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included problem-based case studies "resolved" on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments in CI 240 and CI 241, research papers, digital productions in CI 246 and CI 260, and a Comprehensive Examination in CI 260.
3. Data/Results in CI 240, CI 241, CI 246, and CI 260, indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements.
4. These data were used summer 2016 to refine CI260 and CI246 to continue to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their Culminating Examination.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, the NCATE visit spring 2014, and more specifically the data collected above, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller (faculty responsible for the foundations/curriculum/instruction strand in the MAT) refined CI240 summer 2016 for her fall 2016 offering. Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI 260 and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2016 for their fall 2016 offerings.

**\*(2) Scholar Activist (SA):** ERE 243 (Fall, 2015), **ENTRY**; CI 245 (Spring, 2016), **INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015) CI 298B Fall, 2015) MASTERY**

Students will search, navigate, and critically consume (read, analyze, and use) educational research. This means that:

- Students use electronic search processes to locate appropriate resources.
- Students show familiarity with a range of important journals, including research

journals.

- Students evaluate the appropriateness of different research methods for the particular question being asked and research design.
- Students describe how different research designs broaden or narrow both the questions and the findings.
- Students can critique epistemological assumptions of multiple research paradigms.
- Students can read, evaluate, and use articles that report both quantitative and qualitative research.

The SA learning outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. ERE 243 was refined summer 2015 and assessed fall 2015 by a new faculty Dr. Nancy Akhavan to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 was re- designed before spring 2016 by new faculty Dr. David Low to continue to assist students in reaching this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Eluminate, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in ERE 243, CI245, CI 246, CI 260, and CI 298B indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements. Most significantly, 20% of the MAT Cohort 11 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience, as fine a testament to Dr. Akhavan’s and Dr. Low’s expertise as any.
4. These data were used summer 2016 to refine ERE 243 and CI 245 for the Entry and Intermediate levels respectively and CI260, CI246, and CI298B to assist students reach the Mastery level for their final semester coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience fall 2016.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past four years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, Dr. Nancy Akhavan and Dr. Low (new faculty responsible for the research strand in the MAT) built on these data to refine ERE 243 for fall 2016 CI 245 for spring 2017. Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI 260 and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2016 once these courses concluded fall 2015.

**\*(3) Mixed Methods Action Researcher/Qualitative and Quantitative (MMAR):** ERA243 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE**; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**

Students will use, apply, design, and implement research to bring about change and make improvements in their own professional environment.

This means that:

- Students can describe the main features of action research.
- Students can identify a focused problem related to education, and formally propose a reasonable research process for investigating and acting on that issue.

- Students can design and carry out an applied action research study, project or thesis.
- Students can communicate the completed study, project, or thesis both orally and in written or electronic form.
- Students can identify and use the main features of relevant research design.
- Students can reflect on the process of their research and progress toward change as a result of their research.

The MMAR learning outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. ERA243 was redesigned summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to help students continue to reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 was re-designed before spring 2016 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Eluminate, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments,, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in ERA243 and CI245 indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements. As noted above, 20% of the MAT Cohort 11 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience.
4. These data were used summer 2015 and again summer 2016 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, Dr. Nancy Akhavan refined ERE 243 summer 2015 and 2016 consistent with these data outlined above while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich (faculty responsible for the foundations/curriculum/ instruction strand, CI260, and design of the Culminating Experiences) and Dr. Chris Foster redesign CI246, CI260, and CI298B summer 2016 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2015.

**\* (4) Critically Reflective, Equity-Oriented Practitioner (CREQP):** CI240 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE**; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**

Students will demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to use the most appropriate culturally responsive and inclusionary practices that support complex and challenging learning and development of all pupils.

This means that:

- Students identify, demonstrate and advocate for what it means to teach well in a pluralistic, global context.
- Students actively work to strengthen own practice through reflection and continuing professional and personal development.

The CREO outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. CI240 was redesigned summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was re-designed before spring 2016 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included problem-based case studies “resolved” on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in CI240 and CI241 indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement).
4. These data were used summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller will continue to refine CI240 and CI241 with respect to the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2016 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2015.

**\*(5) Clear Communicator (CC):** CI 240 (Fall), ERE 243 (Fall) **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE**; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**

Students will communicate clearly and effectively orally, in writing, and online and in their action research studies, projects or thesis in a manner that is clear and commands professional attention.

This means that:

- Speaking, writing, and online communication are free of distracting errors.
- Writing and oral communication are organized clearly.
- Forms of communication are appropriate to the topic and audience.
- Conventions of using the work of others are employed correctly and ethically.
- Online posts, action research, etc. shows polish and attention to detail.

The CC outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. CI240 and ERE 243 was redesigned summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 and CI 245 was refined for this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. For CI240 and CI241: Signature Assignments in Blackboard included problem-based case studies “resolved” on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments. For ERA243

and CI245: Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Eluminate, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.

3. Data/Results in all four of these courses indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement) as well as on the Clear Communicator outcomes identified above.
4. These data were used summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller and Dr. Melanie Wenrick continue to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster to build on these data once these courses conclude fall 2015.

**\*(6) Technological Navigator (TN):** CI240 (Fall), ERA243 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE**; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**

Candidate will use technology critically to access information, to communicate, and as a means of curricular and pedagogical support for higher-level thinking.

This means that:

- Students assess the value of technology in relation to the needs of pupils, the values that the technologies communicate, and the relevance to pupil learning.
- Students make decisions about technologies based on ways in which those technologies aid, limit, or hinder the learning process.
- Students use technologies in creative and innovative ways while representing the substance of content being explored.
- Students develop explorative and creative educational applications of technology.
- Students use multiple forms of technology for a range of purposes (e.g., communication, presentation, curriculum development, locating information, organization and classroom management, problem solving, learning support, current technological applications).

The TN outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. CI 240 and ERA 243 were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI 241 and CI 245 were refined before spring 2016 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach the Clear Communicator outcome at the Mastery level.
2. For CI240 and CI241: Signature Assignments in Blackboard included problem-based case studies “resolved” on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments. For ERA243 and CI245: Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules

on Eluminate, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments,, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.

3. Data/Results in all four of these courses indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement). However, the vast majority of the requirements in all four of these courses focused on effective use of technology as a learner, not as a teacher of students.
4. These data were used summer 2015 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience as teachers using technology with students, not primarily as users of technology as learners.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller will continue to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2015.

**\*(7) Social Justice Collaborator (SJC):** CI240 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE**; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**  
Students will work with communities of practice on behalf of social justice. This means that:

- Students connect with parents and communities.
- Students have socio-cultural consciousness; that is, they recognize that the way people perceive the world, interact with one another, and approach learning, among other things, are deeply influenced by such factors as race/ethnicity, social class, language, and disability. This understanding enables students to cross cultural boundaries that separate them from their students, families, and surrounding communities.
- Students develop their own pupils’ critical consciousness.
- Students build democratic participation inside and outside of school.

The SJC outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:

1. CI240 was redesigned summer 2015 (and summer 2016) as repeatedly stressed throughout this document) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was re-designed before spring 2015 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included Multicultural Bibliographies of Community Resources, Social Justice Bibliographies of Community Resources, problem-based case studies “resolved” on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in CI240 and CI241 indicated that nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement).
4. These data were used summer 2015 (and again summer 2016) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen

Culminating Experience.

5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow-up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past four years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller refined CI240 for fall 2016 to build on the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich and Dr. Chris Foster redesigned CI246, CI260, and CI298B to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2016.

**What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

The online MAT program participated in an Accreditation review process under which our program was evaluated by an external body, NCATE, during the 2013-2014 school year. This review and evaluation process included an on-site visit and review of our program from April 6 – 8, 2014. NCATE findings revealed that **all six NCATE standards** were **fully met**, and **no areas for improvement** (AFIs) were indicated. The MAT coordinator and faculty will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change).

## Master of Arts in Education - Curriculum and Instruction (MAE-C&I)

Dr. Carol Fry Bohlin, Coordinator

### LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

---

#### 1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

- **Objective 1.1:** Graduates will identify important theoretical and research-based characteristics of well-developed curricula and use them to analyze curricula.
- **Objective 1.2:** Graduates will identify historical and contemporary issues that have implications for curricular selection and change, including, but not limited to, second language learners, developing a global perspective, state and national standards, and “workplace know-how.”
- **Objective 2.1:** Graduates will evaluate various forms of research and/or evaluation used to document students’ learning, teaching effectiveness, curricula, and programs
- **Objective 2.2:** Graduates will implement instructional strategies that facilitate learning for cognitively, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse populations.
- **Objective 3.2:** Graduates will develop tools to assess students’ content knowledge and attitudes, and evaluate instructional practices or programs, recognizing the biases within different forms of assessment.
- **Objective 4.1:** Graduates will communicate research-based arguments for educational issues, policies, or research design.
- Students’ perceptions of their level of preparedness on 15 items related to professional dispositions and practice.

#### 2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

##### a. Graduate Writing Requirement Assignment

CI 250 (Advanced Curriculum Theory and Analysis) has primary responsibility for assessing Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1. The key assignment that is used to determine the level of a student’s attainment of these objectives is the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR). Two instructors of CI 250 (one in Fall 2015 and Summer 2016 and another in Fall 2015) provided data on student performance according to the rubric.

Instructor A taught (a) one on-campus, non-cohorted section (Fall 2015) where an estimated 75% were Gr. PK-12 teachers and (b) one section (Summer 2016) for students in the Fresno Teacher Residency Program (FTRP), where students earn two teaching credentials (Multiple Subject plus a Foundational-Level Single Subject credential in either mathematics or science) *plus* the MAE-C&I degree in 1.5-2 years. Instructor B taught a fall section of CI 250 for FTRP students. Both instructors used the same rubric to grade the writing assignments, where a score of 3 (“Good”) or 4 (“Excellent”) was required in each category in order to pass the GWR. In last year’s assessment report, it was noted that the first-time pass-rate for the FTRP cohort members was considerably lower than it was for the non-cohorted, on-campus students. The instructor of the cohort recommended that CI 250 be scheduled later in the FTRP students’ credential/master’s course trajectory (not as one of the initial courses).

## **b. Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment**

Objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2 are assessed in CI 275 (Advanced Instructional Theory and Strategies) via the Implementation and Analysis of Teaching assignment. The same instructor taught two sections of CI 275 during 2015-16--during Spring 2016 and during June 2016 (FTRP section). He provided data on student performance according to the approved rubric.

The following prompt and directions were provided to the students: “Design, implement, and evaluate an instructional project that will move you toward improving your instructional skills. Using prior knowledge, readings, and discussions in class, develop a plan to improve your teaching. This project will involve at least one new intervention or instructional strategy with a method to gather data to evaluate the implementation and its effectiveness. Include a discussion of the important issues to consider in both the planning and implementation. The report will describe in detail the entire instructional process, how it was evaluated, and a self-evaluation and reflective analysis of the complete overall process. See the rubric for more specifics.” This assignment is conducted twice during the semester to help support and ascertain student growth.

## **c. Comprehensive Exam**

In addition to analyzing student performance via the Graduate Writing Requirement assignment and the Implementation and Analysis of Teaching assignment, the instructors of CI 250 and CI 275 developed Comprehensive Exam (CE) questions assessing Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1. The exams are required of all students in the Fresno Teacher Residency Program unless they specifically opt to write a project or thesis. The graduate faculty of MAE-C&I have determined that only students who are in special accelerated programs such as the FTRP will be allowed the CE option unless there is a strong rationale for taking the CE. Only one student in the first FTRP cohort elected the project (CI 298A) option. The next CE for an FTRP cohort will be administered in December 2016.

## **d. Exit Surveys**

Data from two instruments assessing student perceptions of program quality and attainment of skills and dispositions have been reviewed in the past as part of this annual report. For a number of years, the KSOEHD Survey was given to students who applied to graduate, or (more recently) a common link was provided so students could fill out the survey online at any time. This survey contained 15 Likert-type items, which asked students to assess the impact the program, had on their professional growth (measures of professional dispositions). The survey also included open-ended items (major strengths of the program; suggestions for potential change), which provided important and useful information for program coordinators. In May 2016, each 2015-16 graduate was sent a unique link to a revised **Kremen End-of-Year Survey**, which included the 15 disposition items.

The **Office of Institutional Effectiveness** is responsible for the second of the two surveys: a survey conducted for the Division of Graduate Studies of graduating master’s and doctoral students. This sentence is at the bottom of the Application to Graduate: **“IMPORTANT NOTE: Please take the **Graduating Students Survey** by clicking on the following link – [https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_0lk7ZagnvdtioKh](https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0lk7ZagnvdtioKh).”** This URL leads the student to a survey that has students rate their classes (relevant, current, available, challenging) and program faculty (knowledgeable about degree requirements and deadlines, helpful,

committed, timely in feedback, and available), among other questions. An open-ended section asks about the most notable aspects of their graduate experience and recommendations for improvement.

### 3. What did you discover from these results?

#### (a) Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR) Assignment

The following chart summarizes the number of students who passed the GWR with a score of 3 (“Good”) or 4 (“Excellent”) in each rubric category on the first, second, or third attempt, as well as the number who haven’t yet passed the GWR, broken down by instructor and cohort:

| Instructor | Passed GWR on 1 <sup>st</sup> attempt | Passed GWR on 2 <sup>nd</sup> attempt | Passed GWR on 3 <sup>rd</sup> attempt | Haven’t passed | Total # of students |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| A          | 24 (96%)                              | 1 (4%)                                | 0                                     | 0              | 25                  |
| A (TRP)    | 19 (95%)                              | 1 (5%)                                | 0                                     | 0              | 20                  |
| B (TRP)    | 4 (18.2%)                             | 11 (50%)                              | 2 (9.1%)                              | 5 (22.7%)      | 22                  |

Instructor A reported that students in both sections of CI 250 were encouraged to submit a preliminary draft of the GWR paper. These drafts were read for content, APA style, and language mechanics. Feedback included suggested APA style resources, review of citations, highlighting of colloquialisms, comments on general academic language, and other suggestions. After editing reflecting the preliminary feedback, students submitted their research papers. Two papers (one in each section) needed additional editing (one needed additional literature review/citations, while the other needed to move from an ethnographic account to a more balanced paper with resources cited). These changes were made, and the students met the requirement.

Instructor B does not require submissions of preliminary drafts of the GWR paper, so the percentage of passing scores on initial submissions is relatively low. However, the majority (all but 2 who submitted a revision) of her students (Fall 2015 class) passed on their second attempt, after some feedback. There are still 5 (out of 22 students) who have not yet submitted a second attempt and thus have not yet passed the GWR. This delay may be in part because of the time-intensity of the FTRP program.

#### (b) Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment:

The following table shows the number of students with rubric scores at each level (4=Excellent, 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor) on the first and the second implementations of this assignment for two semesters in CI 275. As expected, scores on the second assignment were higher than those on the first in each of the classes.

| Rubric Score | Spring 2016 |        | Summer 2016 (FTRP) |        |
|--------------|-------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
|              | First       | Second | First              | Second |
| 4            | 14          | 19     | 15                 | 19     |
| 3            | 4           | 0      | 5                  | 1      |
| 2            | 2           | 0      | 0                  | 0      |
| 1            | 0           | 0      | 0                  | 0      |

**(c) Comprehensive Exam**

The following chart provides the scores of the 19 students who took the Comprehensive Exam during July 2015. All of these students were members of the first Fresno Teacher Residency Program (FTRP) cohort to earn both a teaching credential (or two) and MAE-C&I degree.

The responses to each item were rated as follows by the instructors of the courses (who also wrote the prompts): 1–Fail, 2–Pass, or 3–Exemplary. All students passed the CE on the first attempt. Four of the 19 students earned all 2’s, and six earned all 3’s. Performance was mixed (2’s and 3’s) for the other nine students.

| CI 250       | CI 250           | CI 275            | CI 275         |          |
|--------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| Issues (1.2) | Curriculum (1.1) | Instruction (2.1) | Research (4.1) | PASS ALL |
| 2            | 2                | 2                 | 2              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 2                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 3                | 2                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 2                | 2                 | 2              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 3            | 2                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 2                | 2                 | 2              | Yes      |
| 3            | 3                | 3                 | 3              | Yes      |
| 2            | 2                | 2                 | 2              | Yes      |

#### **(d) Exit Surveys**

##### **- Kremen End-of-Year Survey:**

Of the 48 students who applied to graduate in Spring 2016 or who graduated in Summer or Fall 2015, 16 students completed the survey. Since this is approximately the number of students who graduated in Spring 2016, the low number could be due to proximity to graduation. The FTRP students graduated in Summer 2015, and most of the Sanger cohort members finished in December 2015. Perhaps the Kremen survey could be given at the end of each term.

The survey was designed for all Kremen School programs. All (100%) of the MAE-C&I respondents indicated that they feel “Prepared” or “Extremely Prepared” to do the following:

- Organize my professional tasks and responsibilities.
- Uphold the concept that all individuals can learn.
- Apply my learning to real life situations in my professional practice.
- Conduct myself in accordance to my profession's code of competencies, standards, or ethics.\*
- Collaborate with others in a professional setting.\*
- Engage in lifelong learning. \*\*
- Organize my professional responsibilities.

In addition, all of the respondents indicated that they feel “Prepared” or “Extremely Prepared” to do the following except for the number in parentheses, who indicated that they feel “Moderately Prepared”:

- Use techniques to build rapport with students or clients. (2)
- Have an equity mindset when working with racially and linguistically diverse communities. (3)
- Integrate theoretical foundations in my professional practice. (1)
- Access the research in my field. (1)
- Conduct assessments or evaluations of individuals or organizations. (1)
- Reflect on my learning experiences and their influence on my professional practice. (1)\*\*
- Apply theoretical concepts into practice relevant to my field. (1)

Note: One asterisk (\*) indicates that over two-thirds of respondents marked “Extremely Prepared,” and two asterisks (\*\*) indicates that over 75% of respondents marked “Extremely Prepared.”

In addition to these survey responses, the MAE-C&I coordinator received a number of unsolicited emails and cards expressing appreciation for the great amount of support, advising, and mentoring they have received in the program, as well as the excellent instruction by the faculty.

##### **- OIE Exit Survey (Graduating Students Survey)**

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness reported that, like year, none of the MAE-C&I graduates completed this survey.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?**

##### **(a) Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR) Assignment:**

The success rate of Teacher A's students on this assignment may be indicative of the structured support and guidance the students are given on their papers prior to submitting them for a grade. The FTRP students in Teacher B's class may have especially benefitted from this because students in this intensive program are typically recent graduates of an undergraduate program and take both credential and graduate coursework while student teaching. Thus the master's degree candidates in this program are typically younger and less experienced than the average student in the MAE-C&I program. They also take more courses while teaching during the day than the typical master's student. All of these factors can play a role in course assignment success, including the GWR. We have encouraged all students with writing challenges to utilize the services of the Graduate Writing Studio and will continue to do so.

##### **(b) Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment**

The overall-excellent scores on this assignment indicate that the students are meeting the measured objectives quite well. However, the assignment is challenging for students who do not have access to a classroom of students, preferably their own class. For these students, the instructor needs to make some adaptations to the assignment (from full class to a smaller group of students for instruction with instructor recommendations for implementation, particularly for the graduate athletic coaches), which is not optimal, but necessary.

During June 2016, the instructor taught a section of CI 275 for the FTRP and had expected that the Teacher Residents would be teaching summer school and thus have access to K-6 students, but this was not the case. In the future, scheduling for the FTRP sections of CI 275 should take into account this need for access to K-12 students.

##### **(c) Comprehensive Exam**

The success of the students on the comprehensive exam is likely due in part to the effectiveness of an elective that the FTRP students take which reinforces the objectives assessed on the CE. Thus the course will continue to be offered as part of the curriculum of the FTRP students.

##### **(d) Exit Surveys**

###### **- Kremen End-of-Year Survey**

While we are very pleased with the results of the survey, we are disappointed with the response rate. We will encourage students to complete this survey and hope that it can be sent to students at the end of each term (Summer, Fall, Spring). As with the results on this entire survey, the MAE-C&I program faculty will review the findings and make any necessary adjustments to the program, curriculum, or processes to help ensure student attainment of objectives.

### - OIE Graduating Students Survey

We were quite surprised and again disappointed to learn that there were no OIE Exit Survey data for our program graduates, despite there being a relatively prominent link at the bottom of the application to graduate. Student responses on this survey have been helpful in the past (pre-2011). We will email the link to the OIE Graduating Students Survey ([https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_e3ZwmKqz3y6Oc9D](https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_e3ZwmKqz3y6Oc9D)) to students during the semester they intend to graduate, as well as during the week after they graduate to help ensure that we obtain more data to use in our program evaluation and inform project revision.

As an addendum, we noted that student success (progress to completion) among students in the Sanger master's cohort (experience teachers) was excellent. This spurred us to heavily recruit for another cohort in Chowchilla and, when numbers turned out to be relatively low, the MAE-C&I coordinator actively advertised throughout Madera County with the strong support of the Madera County Office of Education (especially Tricia Protzman) and held an information session at MCOE. We began the **new MAE-C&I cohort in Madera** with a section of CI 250 held at Madera South High School on 23 August 2016.

Last year we noted that the student success rate in online courses for teachers was very low for the members of our program with no teaching experience (especially members of the football coaching staff). More appropriate electives were strongly recommended during advising sessions with the MAE-C&I program coordinator, and success in **electives in other departments** (e.g., Kinesiology) were evident among most students. We still have challenges with some students (particularly those on the coaching staff who are on the road coaching games or recruiting prospects and who must take at least 8 units a semester) meeting the 3.0 GPA requirement. We will continue looking for ways to help support their success.

### **5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-17 academic year?**

During 2016-17, we will continue to use the following methods to measure program objectives:

- **Graduate Writing Requirement Analysis:** Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1
- **Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment Analysis:** Objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2
- **Comprehensive Exam:** Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1
- **Exit Surveys:** These will be used to assess educator dispositions, as well as students' program perceptions and recommendations.
- **Alumni Survey:** We plan to develop an alumni survey to assess graduates' retrospective view of the program and also their current leadership roles (Objectives 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3), as well as to assess their use of technology in their instruction (Objective 3.3), especially if they also earned a Certificate of Advanced Instruction in Educational Technology (CASET).

### **6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

The M.A. in Education Action Plan for 2009-2019 included the goals below. Progress made by the MAE-C&I program since 2009 is included below each:

**(1) Increase the visibility of the program through newsletters, e-blasts to former credential students, updated Web sites, etc.**

- To promote the MAE-C&I program, the Program Coordinator has created and distributed informational flyers about the program over the past 10 years. In Fall 2015, Dr. Fry Bohlin created a poster display for the following events: (a) two Kremen Open Houses held on October 8 (USU) and October 15, 2015 (ED 140) and the (b) Division of Graduate Studies Resource and Recruitment Fair (SSU, February 17, 2016).
- Dr. Fry Bohlin created a Twitter account for the MAE-C&I program ([https://twitter.com/Fresno\\_MA\\_E\\_CI](https://twitter.com/Fresno_MA_E_CI)) and actively tweets information, student pictures, etc., to support and celebrate the MAE-C&I graduate students (and program graduates), as well as to promote the MAE-C&I program, the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASET), and the Fresno Teacher Residency Program (all of the FTRP students are in the MAE-C&I program, as well as a teaching credential program).
- The MAE-C&I website is kept updated with information about the master's degree program, as well as the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASET): <http://www.fresnostate.edu/kremen/graduate/ma-education.html>
- Dr. Fry Bohlin emails all students regularly with detailed program updates and advising notes. She also maintains a very detailed spreadsheet where the progress of all 150+ students is tracked and student information is noted. This helps with targeted and "just in time" advising and student success in the program. This is particularly important since half of the units in the program are electives, and almost no two students have the same set of electives. In addition, over 25% of the students are also pursuing a CASET, which increases the number of required units by 9 for the MAE-C&I students. The FTRP students are also earning at least one teaching credential.
- During 2016, a recruitment grant was received by the MAE-C&I; program materials will be developed during Fall 2016.
- A near-record 42 MAE-C&I students were admitted to the program for Fall 2016. Counting the two FTRP cohorts, the new admits total 82 for Fall 2016, a new program record for a semester.

**(2) Increase the number of courses offered in an online or hybrid format.**

- The MAE-C&I faculty noted that student success and rich, meaningful interaction among classmates and faculty is typically not as great in the online courses as in face-to-face classes, so there has not been a strong motivation to develop online courses. However, CI 225 continues to be primarily online, and some MAE-C&I students take online courses such as CI 240 and CI 241 (courses developed for the MAT program) as electives. Some students take online sections of ERE 153 and ERE 220 to fulfill their research course requirements for the program. To help increase student access to courses, alternative scheduling of classes has been implemented and district-based cohorts have been established.

**(3) Continue partnering with local school districts to form graduate cohorts.**

- We were very pleased that all of the Sanger Unified School District MAE-C&I cohort members graduated during 2015-16. This is the program's second SUSD cohort during this program review period. The last MAE-C&I cohort in Sanger Unified was established in 2008, along with a Central Unified cohort that year. Most of the students from those cohorts graduated in 2009-

2010, an academic year that saw a record high number of MAE-C&I graduates,  $n=48$ , which ties the number who graduated during this past year (2015-16).

- Active recruiting during began during 2015-16 for an MAE-C&I cohort in Madera County to serve that region. This new cohort (the first MAE-C&I cohort in the northern part of our service region) will commence in August 2016.

- The **Teacher Residency Program** began in Fall 2013 as an innovative and powerful partnership between Fresno Unified School District (FUSD) and the Kremen School with S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation grant support. While the initial TRP cohort did not include a master's degree, the university's first unified Multiple Subject credential (and Foundational-Level Mathematics or FL General Science credential) and master's (MAE-C&I) program was initiated in 2014, with students admitted to the master's program that fall. Since that time, three more credential/MAE-C&I cohorts have been started (TRP 3 began during Fall 2016), all with support from a 5-year U.S. Department of Education 2014 Teacher Quality Partnership grant administered by FUSD.

- We have made initial contact with Fresno Unified School District's coordinator of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to explore the possibility of developing a partnership with the district to support teachers attaining National Board certification as well as an MAE-C&I degree.

- We continue to offer courses at times convenient for teachers, including 4-6:50 p.m. and 7-9:50 p.m. Monday-Friday, all day Saturday, and during the summer when possible.

#### **(4) Continually revise our courses for relevance and currency.**

- MAE-C&I program faculty take this very seriously, continually updating course requirements, assignments, and resources. Appropriate and current use of instructional technologies is modeled. This is facilitated through the excellent, cutting edge computer labs in the Kremen Education Building (ED 157, ED 165, and ED 169), where most of the CASSET courses and many of the ERE courses are taught.

#### **(5) Model and infuse current technologies in our courses.**

- See (4) above. The MAE-C&I program has benefitted from its close relationship with the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASSET) program. Many MAE-C&I students take at least one of the courses designed for this certificate program, and a number of students elect to earn the Certificate in addition to the master's degree, providing them with documentation of their additional expertise in educational technology.

The CASSET was initiated in 1991-92 by Otto Benavides, Dr. Roy Bohlin, and Dr. Nancy Hunt, who developed CI 225 (Benavides and Hunt), CI 227 (Bohlin), and CI 230 (Hunt), along with 2 electives that are no longer on the books. Dr. R. Bohlin, the current CASSET coordinator, developed the following two 3-unit courses in 2013 following a resurgence of interest in the program and schools' need for teachers with this knowledge and expertise:

- **Designing Motivating Instruction** – This course is designed to explore instructional design, a number of motivational theories, and the integration of technology into instruction. Students will investigate theories and models of designing motivating instruction, as well as investigate exemplary activities and strategies to motivate target groups.

**- Exploring Technology and Critical Thinking** – This class involves series of explorations of various technological tools – simulations, problem-solving applications, complex search engines, etc. The focus is on the theoretical foundations of critical thinking and how specific applications of student-centered instruction can improve the quality and depth of teaching and learning in classrooms.

In addition, the following 3-unit course was developed and first taught by Dr. Bohlin in Spring 2016:

**- Exploring Innovative Technologies** – This course provides opportunities for students to explore fifteen different innovative technologies (e.g., 3D printing, gamification, data analytics, etc.). Together with the instructor, students will discuss and plan ways that these might be integrated into learning experiences in classrooms and co-curricular activities.

**(6) Project new hires that will be needed over the next 10 years and put emphasis on recruitment as well as retaining new faculty.**

- Since 2009, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has hired six new faculty members, (Dr. Frederick Nelson, Dr. Libbi Miller, Dr. Mariya Yukhymenko, Dr. Trang Phan, Dr. Emy Lopez Phillips, and Dr. Myung Shin), all of whom have graduate faculty status. In addition, two members of the Kremen research faculty (one untenured) from the former Educational Research and Foundations Department requested and were granted permission to become members of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Faculty mentors are actively supporting the excellent probationary faculty members and hope that they will continue to enjoy being Fresno State faculty members for years to come! We project that we will need to hire new faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction to teach CI 250, CI 275, CI 285, and our CASET courses during the next 10 years when many of the faculty who were hired during the 1980s and 1990s will be retiring and when the majority of our newly hired faculty will most likely be moving to the new Liberal Studies Department (pending approval).

**(7) Maintain state and national program accreditation (e.g., CTC, NCATE, NAEYC, etc.).**

- All initial and advanced programs in the Kremen School of Education and Human Development received outstanding reviews during the last state (CTC) and national (NCATE) accreditation visits in March 2014. No areas for improvement were identified.

**(8) Develop an additional Option on Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners**

The M.A.Ed. **Option in Multilingual and Multicultural Education** received approval in 2013. Its mission is “to provide advanced level candidates with a foundation in research, curriculum, and leadership in order to promote equity in schools serving linguistically and culturally diverse (LCD) learners.” Although this is a separate option from the MAE-C&I program, several of the courses developed for the MME option are appropriate as electives for a number of our student

**Master of Arts in Education – Educational Leadership & Administration**  
**Dr. Linda Hauser, Coordinator**

**LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

The Educational Leadership and Administration degree program has two pathways: P-12 (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential) and Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership [HEAL] (which leads to a Master of Arts in Education: Option Educational Leadership and Administration). The Department of Educational Leadership is working on a proposal for HEAL to be a specific option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State through the Department of Educational Leadership, however in light of a recently discussed Executive Order, both pathways may write proposals as two separate master's degrees under the Department of Educational Leadership. For the 2016-17 academic year, our two pathways have a combined 194 students (150 P-12 and 44 HEAL). Our instructional delivery is through a cohort delivery model (eight cohorts); the six P-12 cohorts all operate off the Fresno State campus in partnership districts across the Central Valley. The two HEAL cohorts operate on campus.

Due to the Educational Leadership and Administration Program context and the major changes adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, which significantly impacts the Educational Leadership and Administration Master's Degree and Advanced Credential Program (P-12 pathway), and in consultation with Dr. Jordine, we have revised the assessment report template to better communicate the assessment activity of the Educational Leadership and Administration Program given our local context and evolving state context

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program is undergoing exciting, however major transition and change due to adoption of new standards by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the development stages of a California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), and continued proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option or separate degree. The CTC adopted new standards for the Preliminary Administrator Services Credential, in which all accredited and approved sponsors of programs transitioned to in fall 2015, however, transition still continues with a June 2016 revise of the adopted standards. The CTC approved requiring a performance assessment (CalAPA) for all preliminary administrative services credential candidates completing a Commission approved preparation program. The development of the CalAPA is currently underway, and our program has requested to participate in pilot testing (2016-17), field-testing (2017-18), Scoring (2016-17 and 2017-18), and Standard Setting (2018).

**2015-16 Assessment Activity of the Educational Leadership and Administration Program (P-12 pathway)**

All P-12 full-time faculty (Academic Task Force) met one to two times a month during the 2015-16 academic year for the purpose of alignment review of the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs – our new student learner outcomes), the new program

competency tasks we developed, and the practice experiences/tasks we developed that would result in student competence. We have expanded the types of tools and techniques we are using to evidence and measure student learning. Many of our student learner outcomes are performance outcomes; therefore, we have greatly expanded the use of video and observation. As described by our cohort model structure above, we have multiple cohorts engaged in competency tasks of the same course. The Academic Task Force (ATF) has been reviewing and discussing student work products for a given competency task to assess whether the task, work, product, and criteria for student success are all aligned and evidencing at a competent level the intent of the student learner outcome (CAPE). This has been and is an on-going process due the most recent June 2016 revision of the standards, the current development of the CalAPA, and the on-going updates from the CTC. Continuous alignment and improvement and closing the loop are a focus of every Academic Task Force Meeting. Two ATF meetings a month have already been scheduled for the fall 2016 semester. Two ATF meetings have already been held during August 2016.

Our program is built on a competency/performance based learning and assessment system. Students are reassessed and resubmit assessment products until they meet the indicator(s) for competent. Instructors provide effective feedback as well as design and deliver additional learning experiences to support each student in achieving competence. ATF data collection, through professional conversations and student work samples, has informed and continues to inform lesson and task revisions. We are currently working with Dr. Jordine and team to develop and implement a Program Pathbrite Portfolio for all Competency Tasks beginning with three new fall 2016 cohorts (Clovis, Fresno, and Visalia). Dr. Jordine presented at the New Cohort Orientation for Clovis and Visalia as well as worked with all faculty at the Educational Leadership Department Retreat in August.

Provided below is a sampling of student learning outcomes derived from the CAPEs that were assessed through our initial transition to the new standards in the 2015-16 academic year, their competency task measures, indicators and standards of success, results, discovery from results, and adjustments or changes made based on the results:

| <b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>   | <b>Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures</b>  |
|--|---|
| <p>Graduates/candidates will (a) develop techniques in identifying, collecting, analyzing, and evaluating various types of data that engage and support school staff in analyzing instructional effectiveness and (b) use a 6-step data-driven decision-making process to inform instructional improvement and programmatic decisions.</p> | <p>Written Paper – Unit Development (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)<br/>           Presentation w/peer feedback and self-assessment (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)<br/>           Video clip demonstration with written explanation (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)<br/>           Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality Standard: 100% of students evidencing.<br/>           Competent or Quality for each student success criterion on scoring rubric</p> |
| <p>Graduates will develop knowledge and skill in the use of effective training processes and protocols to build teacher capacity in assessment literacy.</p>   |   |

**Results:** 49 of 57 students met indicators on first submission. Two teams of four (4) students were required to revise written presentation materials to evidence deeper concept knowledge of the importance of clear communication in the delivery of new information. Revisions included (a) greater clarity of instructional strategies identified to support student sub-groups and (b) inclusion of research to support application of the 6-step data-driven process.

*Note: Graduates/Candidates must score Competent or Quality for each criterion given a Competency Task in a program course; therefore, graduates/candidates must redo and resubmit any task not meeting the indicator of Competent or Quality.*

**Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings:**

Based on data from faculty feedback sessions (Academic Task Force meetings) and graduate student work products, we discovered that graduates found it difficult to explain the process from the perspective of a school leader. Graduates delivered information as if they were the learner, rather than the facilitator of others’ learning. As a result of these findings, faculty will increase focus on developing graduate (a) concept knowledge of adult learning theories/principles and the role leaders play in system change and (b) skills and approaches in facilitating adult learning and communicating purpose and processes used in teacher-led data-driven decision making. Additionally, Graduates struggled with conceptualizing the relationship between written, taught, and tested curriculum. To deepen Graduate knowledge regarding this relationship, in class activities, such as “unwrapping standards” and development of aligned formative assessment test items, will be integrated into future lesson design and delivery.

| Student Learning Outcomes  | Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures  |
|--|--|
| <p>Graduates/Candidates will conduct a data mining process and examine, analyze, and evaluate a school’s information and analysis system (types of data collected, purpose of data collected, data form, frequency of collection, data collectors [who], consumers [ users], and processes used to collect, analyze and communicate data).</p> <p>Graduates will use information gained from the data mining process to identify improvement areas for focus and inform next step high leverage actions.</p> | <p>Synthesized Table (Matrix) (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Written Analysis &amp; Evaluation (criteria for student success and scoring rubric)</p> <p>Scoring Rubrics Indicator:<br/>Competent or Quality</p> <p>Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each student success criterion on scoring rubric</p> |

**Results:** 50 of 57 graduates met indicators on first submission. Seven (7) Graduates were required to revise a portion of the task and resubmit. The areas graduates did not meet competency on first submission were: (a) gathering sufficient data to inform next best decisions, (b) written analysis and evaluation from a school leader viewpoint/perspective, and (c) identification of **high-leverage school improvement actions** – actions were based on data collected and some graduates struggled with the concept of high leverage and rationale as to why a particular action would be high leverage.

### **Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings:**

Graduates struggled with: (a) collection of sufficient rich data required to make informed decisions, (b) considering the entire system (system perspective) over that of just their individual classrooms, (c) distinguishing between actions that are high-leverage vs. actions with limited impact on the system, and (d) use of information across data streams to identify root cause. As a result of these findings, the use of state and national data streams will be expanded in future lesson design and delivery. Additional learning experiences will be provided that support Graduates with practice in turning useful data into information and collaborating with colleagues to make data-driven decisions; understanding how actions can create or eliminate barriers and affect school-wide systems in place at a school.

### **2015-16 Learning Outcome Assessed Across P-12 and HEAL Pathways**

The department of Educational Leadership and faculty in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program focused on assessment activity relate to SLO 7.1 Graduates, as educational leaders, will *access and review educational literature and research and write about educational areas, issues and problems*. Assessment activity centered on the written communication core competency area, specifically, we assessed student learning on the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR).

Department faculty (P-12 and HEAL) acknowledged that our current more holistic (pass/fail) rubric for the GWR is inadequate in providing the types of data that will help inform and drive next step decisions: (a) specific graduate/candidate competencies and support and (b) program cohort areas of focus. The focus of this assessment work was not only important, but also extremely powerful in bringing together two distinct pathways (P-12 and Higher Education) as one P-16 system; a system with one very specific set of expectations/learning outcomes in the core competency area of written communication. Department faculty were awarded a 2015 -16 Assessment Grant administered by OIE titled: Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders.

### **Instrument Used to Assess Outcome**

Direct Measure: A rubric developed by five faculty members in the department was used to assess student competency given written prompts for the Graduate Writing requirement. Securing an OIE assessment grant advanced department efforts on this work. The grant funding provided the motivation needed to have a rubric apply to students' GWR assignment in EAD 261. See Appendix for the Rubric. Benchmark (or standard) is 100% passing since the GWR is a graduation requirement.

Three sections of *EAD 261: Introduction to Educational Administration* in Fall 2015 were selected to conduct this assessment activity. EAD 261 was selected because all enrolled students were in their first semester of their first year of their graduate program.

### **HEAL Pathway**

Within the structure of the course curriculum, the Short Essay II assignment embedded into the EAD 261 curriculum, provided a great opportunity for generative writing after admission and early in their program before filing an Advancement to Candidacy petition.

### **P-12 Pathway**

Two-hour written assessment on an assigned topic related to school leadership. Student's use evidence from readings on research and/or best practices in education to make connections and support arguments.

### **Discovery from the Data**

#### **HEAL pathway**

Results for this assessment project were derived from n=17 master's students in EAD 261 in Fall 2015. Results showed 100% of students met the graduate writing competency with n=2 (11%) students receiving recommendations to visit the Graduate Writing Studio (GWS) at some point during their first year of graduate studies. These results show that graduate students in the department of Educational Leadership demonstrate effective written communication competencies using generative writing prompts. In addition, results from this assessment activity assist faculty in guiding students in specific areas of growth and development and provide a specific focus for our students' work with the university's GWS.

#### **• Pathway**

Results for this assessment were derived from n=32 master's students in EAD 261 in Fall 2015. Results showed 97% (31 of 32) of students met the graduate writing competency on the first administration. One student (second language learner) did not meet expectation and was provided effective feedback and a system of support. This student met the graduate writing competency on the second administration of the assessment. The following are the relative strengths and weaknesses that emerged from analysis based on the rubric. Individual relative strengths and weaknesses were shared with students and some students were guided to seek additional support, such as the GWS, for areas in need of growth and development.

Based on rubric:

#### **Relative strengths:**

- Focused topics.
- Took a position and presented relevant points/information to support argument.
- Basic grammar and sentence structure appropriate to strong.
- All papers (written responses) were relevant and related to the topic. No papers off-topic.
- Organization of paper was logical.
- Papers included references to research and best practices.
- L-2 interference noticeable in two of the essays (written responses), but did not interfere with meaning, or otherwise detract from the flow of the papers.

#### **Relative Weaknesses:**

- Majority of written responses followed a standard format.
- Limited references to research.

- References to research more often discussed through quotes and meaning of quotes rather than deep analysis of the research.
- Connections between ideas somewhat superficial.
- Few "raised important issues or ideas" beyond those at a foundational level.
- More informal than academic writing.
- Minor grammar
- Two written responses would "*serve as a good basis for further research on the topic*" (per rubric)

### **Changes made as a Result of Data Analysis**

Assessment data collected from the GWR direct measure integrated in EAD261 improved the department's curricula and teaching by helping faculty determine how educational leaders use written language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. This assessment will ultimately serve to support the department's graduate students in their growth and development preparing for effective leadership in our region's schools, colleges, and universities.

Because written communication appears in many forms and genres, successful written communication for educational leaders will depend on "mastery of the conventions of the written language, facility with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience, and other situation-specific factors" (WASC, 2013, p. 58).

This definition of the written communication core competency was an important part of the assessment activity. Faculty operated from a perspective to improve the department's academic programs by preparing students to receive consistent and constant feedback on their writing. The assessment activity also provided students timely feedback during their first semester of graduate school. This time of rapid transition and increased academic expectations is crucial for the students we serve at Fresno State.

### **2015-16 Learning Outcome Assessed Across P-12 and HEAL Pathways**

Program Component: Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application SLO 7.1 Graduates, as educational leaders, will *access and review educational literature and research and write about educational areas, issues and problems.*

All students pursuing a master's degree must meet degree expectations for the culminating master's experience indicated on their Advancement to Candidacy form. One of the culminating experience options is the Master's Degree Research Project (MDRP)/EAD 298. A Project Rubric is used to guide the assessment of the MDRP and the indicator for *meets degree expectation* for this culminating experience is an A or B, Benchmark: 95%.

Fifty-six students pursuing a master's degree (combined P-12 and HEAL pathways), with intent to graduate in 2015-16 academic year, selected the MDRP option. Of the 56 students, 55 completed a MDRP and met degree expectation of an A or B (98%). One student has not yet met expectation and is enrolled to complete in fall 2016.

During the spring of 2015, our department faculty selected an EAD 298 Project Ad Hoc Committee to work on issues as well as opportunities for improvement generated through department professional learning conversations relative EAD 298 Project. Data conversations revealed one primary issue that needed to be addressed and three areas as opportunities for improvement. The primary issue was the variability in student research preparedness for the MDRP, and the three areas as opportunities for improvement included: improve the clarity and develop shared understanding of the research study component and applied component; improve the clarity and develop shared understanding of the department IRB process; and review, revise, and develop, as appropriate and needed, written documents for continuity and quality of support provided to students. Our most compelling issue was the variability in student research preparedness for the MDRP. ERE 220 is a primary course in laying the foundation for our culminating master's experiences. This is a common course used across most master's degrees in the School of Education. Although there is a common course master syllabus, findings revealed great variability among our cohorts of students in the knowledge and skills they developed as a result of the focus of their work in ERE 220. Many of the instructors for this course are instructors outside our department and adjunct faculty. This is not a criticism of the instructors, but an indication of a larger systems issue of alignment and the need to build shared understanding of *sound preparedness* for culminating master's experience options in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program.

During the 2015-16 year, the Department of Educational Leadership executed the following actions to address the primary issue and opportunities for improvement:

- Worked more closely with the department that schedules the instructors for ERE 220 to:
  - (a) include more Educational Leadership faculty teaching this course to Educational Leadership and Administration cohorts, (b) select specific consistent adjunct faculty who will teach Educational Leadership and Administration Program cohorts, and (c) to provide all instructors who are assigned to teach ERE 220 Educational Leadership and Administration Program cohorts with professional development regarding what *sound preparedness* means as well as the specific outcomes including work products expected as a result of Educational Leadership and Administration Program students' active participation in this course.
- Revised the MDRP Handbook for students and advisers to provide more detail and clarity regarding the research study component and applied component.
- More clearly defined the Department IRB process through the revision and development of written documents and selection of a more formal department review committee.
- Dr. Susana Hernández developed EAD 298 on-line modules for faculty to provide better guidance and consistent support to students. Dr. Hernández piloted the modules in spring 2016. Two additional department faculty are piloting in fall 2016, with intent of full use by all faculty in spring 2017.

### **SOAP: Learning Outcomes, Instruments, and Assessment Methods**

The SOAP for the Educational Leadership and Administration Program is currently under construction to reflect transition to the new California Administrative Services Credential (ASC)

program standards, revised CAPEs, development of the CalAPA, and a proposal for HEAL to either become an option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State or a separate master's degree, in light of Executive Order 1071. Therefore, strong alignment of our latest documented SOAP and our program's current specific assessment activity (student learning outcomes, instruments, and assessment methods) does not exist. The signature assignment and embedded field work scores are being replaced with student learning results on foundation and competency tasks as these tasks and criteria for student success more fully develop (fall 2016 and after CalAPA pilot and scoring - spring 2017) and will continue to be reviewed and revised as appropriate, post CalAPA field-test and scoring (2017-18) and post Standard Setting (2018).

Two direct measures and assessment methods indicated on our latest documented program SOAP, Graduate Writing Score and Culminating Experience Assessment Scores, will transfer to the new SOAPS under construction. The Graduate Writing measure and two Culminating Experience measures (Thesis and Master's Degree Research Project) are used across both pathways (P-12 and HEAL)

### **Academic Year**

- A department goal for 2016-17 submitted on our Annual Report to the Provost was:  
*Implement, adjust, and refine the foundation system developed for the Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders bringing together both pathways (PreK-12 and HEAL).*
- By December 2016, the Graduate Writing Department Ad Hoc Committee should be completed with their work based on the work of the grant with the goal of educating all department faculty in January/February 2017 and full implementation of our system in fall 2017. Assessment activity program-wide will be focused in this area.
- A department goal for 2016-17 submitted on our Annual Report to the Provost was:  
*By fall 2017, finalize the digital platform for EAD 298/Project with expected training of and use by all faculty advisers.* Assessment activity program-wide related to the culminating master's degree program option EAD 298 will continue to be a focus of assessment activity.
- The culminating master's degree program option of Comprehensive Exam will be a focus of program-wide assessment activity.
- **Pathway Assessment Activities in the 2016-2017 AY**
- Execute a cycle of review for each Competency Task in EAD 261, EAD 272, EAD 280T and EAD 262 and further develop the criteria for success scoring rubrics.
- Come to consensus on Pathbrite **Program Portfolio** competencies; build faculty and student capacity in the use of Pathbrite Educational Leadership and Administration **Program Portfolio**, and initiate use with three new fall 2016 cohorts for CAPE competencies in EAD 261, EAD 272, and EAD 280T.
- Develop a system for documenting PASC District Mentor work in **Pathbrite Program Portfolio** and assessment review.

**HEAL Pathway Assessment Activities in the 2016-2017 AY**

- Initiate development of the Comprehensive Exam as a culminating experience option for HEAL pathway in alignment with P-12 pathway.

**Progress from Last Program Review Action Plan**

*Our program participated in an Accreditation review process under which our program was evaluated by two external bodies, NCATE and CCTC, during the 2013-2014 school year. This review and evaluation process included an on-site visit and review of our program from April 6 – 8, 2014. NCATE findings revealed that **all six NCATE standards** were **fully met**, and **no areas for improvement (AFIs)** were indicated. CCTC findings revealed that **all of our program standards** were **fully met**.*

*We will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports us in sustaining a program of high quality, which was acknowledged and recognized by our external reviewers.*

However, as stated in the opening section of this Assessment Report under **Context**, *the Educational Leadership and Administration Program is undergoing exciting, yet major transition and change due to adoption of new standards by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the development stages of a California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), and continued proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option or separate degree.* Progress regarding this transition and these changes occurs weekly as evidenced by the work already completed by the Academic Task Force and HEAL Team to date. This work continues as described in the **Context** section of the report.

**Appendix: GWR Rubric for the Department of Educational Leadership**

| <i>Criteria</i>                        | <i>Meets Graduate Writing Competency (3)</i>  | <i>Meets Graduate Writing Competency — Visit the Graduate Writing Studio(2)</i>                     | <i>Does Not Meet Graduate Writing Competency— Visit the Graduate Writing Studio (1)</i> |
|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Objective(s) are clearly stated</b> | The writer’s purpose or position is clear and is the primary voice throughout the paper.<br><br>The writer allows for individuality of expression and purpose | The writer’s purpose or position is generally clear and is the primary voice for parts of the paper | The writer’s purpose or position is not clear   |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Provides orderly presentation of ideas supported by evidence</b></p> | <p>The writer provides supporting evidence which demonstrates a strong relationship to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is cohesive and logically developed</p>   | <p>The writer provides some supporting evidence which demonstrates a moderate relationship to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is somewhat cohesive and is not logically developed</p>   | <p>The writer does not provide supporting evidence which relates to the objective</p> <p>Presentation of supporting evidence is not cohesive and is not logically developed</p> <p>Provides irrelevant or no sources</p>  |
| <p><b>Precise and clear expression</b></p>                                 | <p>The writer is frugal with words and communicates the objective with smooth transitions and consistent verb tenses.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are well developed and varied, avoids jargon.</p>  | <p>The writer embellishes and exceeds recommend page length and communicates the objective with some sudden transitions and inconsistent verb tenses.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are somewhat developed and varied, uses jargon sparingly.</p>                                   | <p>The writer embellishes and makes abrupt transitions. Unnecessary shifts in verb tense in the same or adjacent paragraphs.</p> <p>Sentence and paragraph structure and vocabulary are not developed or varied, uses jargon throughout.</p>                          |
| <p><b>Style and formatting</b></p>   | <p>The writer adheres to all style requirements of the most up to date edition of the APA Publication Manual</p> <p>Cites sources correctly</p> <p>The writer commits no spelling, grammar, and style errors.</p> <p>Demonstrates thoroughness in overall formatting.</p> | <p>The writer generally adheres to some style requirements of the most up to date edition of the APA Publication Manual</p> <p>Cites some sources correctly, but is inconsistent</p> <p>The writer commits some spelling, grammar, and style errors but demonstrates thoroughness in overall formatting.</p> | <p>The writer does not adhere to the style requirements of the APA Publication Manual.</p> <p>Does not cite sources correctly</p> <p>The writer commits multiple spelling, grammar, and style errors and fails to demonstrate thoroughness in overall formatting.</p> |

**1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

SLO: 1.4. Apply professional counseling expertise under direct supervision

SLO: 1.1. Articulate orally and in written form a theoretical base and rationale for counseling

**2. What instruments (assignment) did you use to assess them?**

SLO 1.1. Counselors-in-training undergo evaluation in multiple courses, most notably COUN 200 and COUN 208. Skills rubrics were developed to assess student progress and development. In addition, feedback was sought from community stakeholders (i.e. site supervisors and employers).

SLO 1.4. Counselors-in-training undergo evaluation in multiple courses, most notably COUN 200 and COUN 208. Skills rubrics were developed to assess student progress and development. In addition, feedback was sought from community stakeholders (i.e. site supervisors and employers) through interviews and meetings as well as written feedback regarding counselor-in-training progress in COUN 219, COUN 239, and COUN 249. Finally, all students in the program undergo a Clinical Review in COUN 208 in which a dispositional assessment of professional fit is conducted.

**3. What did you discover from the data?**

On the whole, student progress was developmentally on target in both areas. Programmatic weakness is most evident in students' ability to articulate and apply counseling theories. This was evident in practice, in feedback from new faculty, and in communication with stakeholders.

Two students did not pass Clinical Review due to dispositional concerns and currently are completing requirements for remediation.

**4. What changes did you make as a result of the data?**

Given recent changes in accreditation standards, a team of faculty was assembled to reassess how theories are taught in the counseling program. This team will present proposed curriculum changes during the Fall 2016 semester in order to address this weakness in COUN 200 and COUN 208. A training for faculty (part-time and full-time) impacted by the change will occur before the implementation of the changes.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?**

The Counselor Education program will continue conducting Clinical Review and is beginning the process of addressing new CACREP accreditation standards that will require increased standardization of assessments across the curriculum.

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

Faculty continue to assess the validity of the comprehensive exam. Two new faculty began their appointments in the Fall 2016 semester. The department, however, continues to be out of compliance concerning CACREP ratios. Faculty will begin reviewing admissions procedures and protocols in order to decrease departmental admissions.

**Additional Guidelines:**

See attached skills rubrics and updated Clinical Review form.

**Counseling Skills Assessment 1**

Name of Counselor-in-Training:

Date of Observation:

Name of Observer:

**Non-Verbal Behaviors**

| Behavior            | Check if Observed | Comments |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Eye Contact         |                   |          |
| Body Posture        |                   |          |
| Facing Client       |                   |          |
| Relaxed             |                   |          |
| Gestures            |                   |          |
| Voice Level         |                   |          |
| Rate of Speech      |                   |          |
| Pauses, Silence     |                   |          |
| Distance            |                   |          |
| Touch               |                   |          |
| Autonomic Responses |                   |          |

**Verbal Behaviors**

| Behavior              | Check if Observed | Comments |
|-----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Reflection of Feeling |                   |          |
| Paraphrase of Message |                   |          |
| Clarification         |                   |          |
| Summarization         |                   |          |

Comments:

## Counseling Skills Assessment 2

Name of Counselor-in-Training:

Date of Observation:

Name of Observer:

### Non-Verbal Behaviors

| Behavior            | Check if Observed | Comments |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Eye Contact         |                   |          |
| Body Posture        |                   |          |
| Facing Client       |                   |          |
| Relaxed             |                   |          |
| Gestures            |                   |          |
| Pauses, Silence     |                   |          |
| Distance            |                   |          |
| Prompts             |                   |          |
| Autonomic Responses |                   |          |

### Verbal Behaviors

| Behavior              | Check if Observed | Comments |
|-----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Reflection of Feeling |                   |          |
| Paraphrase of Message |                   |          |
| Clarification         |                   |          |
| Summarization         |                   |          |
| Probing               |                   |          |
| Prompts               |                   |          |
| Exploration           |                   |          |

Comments:

### Counseling Skills Assessment 3

Name of Counselor-in-Training:

Date of Observation:

Name of Observer:

Non-Verbal Behaviors:

Verbal Behaviors

| Basic Skills         | Check if Observed | Comments |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Open-ended Questions |                   |          |
| Clarification        |                   |          |
| Summarization        |                   |          |
| Probing              |                   |          |
| Interpretation       |                   |          |

| Advanced Skills              | Check if Observed | Comments |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Sharing Empathic Highlights  |                   |          |
| Information Sharing          |                   |          |
| Self-disclosure              |                   |          |
| Immediacy                    |                   |          |
| Suggestions/ Recommendations |                   |          |
| Confrontation                |                   |          |
| Encouragement                |                   |          |

Comments:

**COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO**

**CLINICAL REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE**

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Year \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Pass / No Pass

| Professional Performance Standards                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Comments |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----------|
| <b><i>Professional Behaviors</i></b>                         |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 1. Attention to Ethical and Legal Considerations             |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| <b><i>Interpersonal Indicators</i></b>                       |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 2. Cooperativeness with Others                               |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 3. Awareness of Own Impact on Others                         |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 4. Ability to Deal with Conflict                             |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| <b><i>Personal Dispositions</i></b>                          |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 5. Openness to New Ideas                                     |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 6. Tolerates Ambiguity                                       |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 7. Willingness to Accept and Use Feedback                    |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 8. Ability to Accept Personal Responsibility                 |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 9. Ability to Express Feelings Effectively and Appropriately |   |   |   |   |   |          |
| 10. Initiative and Motivation                                |   |   |   |   |   |          |

**Rubric for Rating the Professional Performance Standards**

| Professional Standards  |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Attention to Ethical and Legal Considerations<br>Rated from Inattentive (1) to Attentive (5)                         |   |  |   |  |
| 1   | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  |
| Engaged in dual relationships with clients  |   | Was responsive to supervision for occasional personal-professional boundary confusion in verbal interactions with clients  |   | Maintained clear personal-professional boundaries with clients         |
| Acted with prejudice toward those of different race, culture, gender or sexual orientation or other diversity than self |   | Was responsive to supervision for occasional insensitivity to diversity in professional interactions                       |   | Demonstrated consistent sensitivity to diversity                       |
| Endangered the safety and the well-being of clients   |   | Used judgment that could have put client safety and well-being at risk   |   | Satisfactorily ensured client safety and well-being                    |
| Breached established rules for protecting client confidentiality including safeguards in technology used                |   | Used judgment that could have put client confidentiality at risk including not used safeguards for any technology utilized |   | Appropriately safeguarded the confidentiality of clients including any |

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  |  | technology used   |
| Demonstrated insensitivity to role differences and power dynamics that may exist in relationship and settings, and does not manage them appropriately |  | Sometimes maintained sensitivity to role differences and power dynamics that may exist in relationships and settings, and manages them appropriately | Always maintained sensitivity to role differences and power dynamics that may exist in relationships and settings, and manages them appropriately |

| <b>Interpersonal</b>   |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>2. Cooperativeness with Others</b><br>Rated from Uncooperative (1) to Cooperative (5) |   |  |   |   |
| 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   |
| Demonstrated little or no engagement in collaborative activities                         |   | Engaged in collaborative activities but with minimum input           |   | Worked actively toward reaching consensus in collaborative activities             |
| Demonstrated unwillingness to compromise in collaborative activities                     |   | Accepted but rarely initiated compromise in collaborative activities |   | Demonstrated willingness to initiate compromise in order to reach group consensus |
| Undermined goal achievement in collaborative activities                                  |   | Was concerned mainly with own part in collaborative activities       |   | Showed concern for group as well as Individual goals in collaborative activities  |

| <b>3. Awareness of Own Impact on Others</b><br>Rated from Unaware (1) to Aware (5)        |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1   | 2 | 3   | 4 | 5   |
| Words and actions reflected little or no concern for how others were impacted by them     |   | Effort to determine how own words and actions impacted others was evident but sometimes inaccurate              |   | Effort toward recognition of how own words and actions impacted others was accurate   |
| Ignored supervisory feedback about how words and actions were negatively impacting others |   | Responded as necessary to feedback regarding negative impact of words and actions but at times, with resentment |   | Initiated feedback from others regarding impact of own words and behaviors; regularly incorporated feedback to effect positive change |

| <b>4. Ability to Deal with Conflict</b><br>Rated from Unable (1) to Able (5) |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  |
| Was unable or unwilling to consider others' points of view                   |   | Attempted but sometimes had difficulty grasping conflicting points of view |   | Demonstrated willingness and ability to consider others' points of view    |
| Did not demonstrate willingness to examine own role in a conflict            |   | Examined own role in a conflict only when directed to do so                |   | Displayed willingness to examine own role in conflict consistently         |
| Ignored supervisory advisement if not in agreement with own position         |   | Was responsive to supervision in a conflict if it was offered              |   | Was consistently open to supervisory critique about own role in a conflict |
| Did not show any effort a problem solving                                    |   | Participated in problem solving when directed                              |   | Initiated problem solving efforts in conflicts                             |
| Displayed hostility when conflicts were addressed                            |   |  |   | Actively participated in problem solving efforts                           |

| <b>Personal Disposition</b>   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>5. Openness to New Ideas</b><br>Rated from Closed (1) to Open (5)                                |   |   |   |   |
| 1   | 2 | 3   | 4 | 5   |
| Was dogmatic about own perspective and ideas  |   | Was amenable to discussion of perspectives other than own   |   | Solicited others' opinions and perspectives about own work                                |
| Ignored or was defensive about constructive feedback  |   | Accepted constructive feedback without defensiveness  |   | Invited constructive feedback and demonstrated interest in others' perspectives           |
| Showed little or no evidence of incorporating constructive feedback received to change own behavior |   | Demonstrated some evidence of effort to incorporate relevant feedback received to change own behavior |   | Demonstrated strong evidence of incorporation of feedback received to change own behavior |

| 6. Tolerates Ambiguity<br>Rated from Intolerant (1) to Tolerant (5)  |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   |
| Shown little or no effort to <i>recognize</i> changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling                                |   | Made some effort to <i>recognize</i> changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling but was sometimes inaccurate          |   | Showed accurate effort to <i>recognize</i> changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling                            |
| Shown little or no effort to <i>flex</i> own response to changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling                     |   | Effort of <i>flex</i> own response to changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling was evident but sometimes inaccurate |   | Demonstrated accurate effort to <i>flex</i> own response to changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling as needed |
| Refused to flex own response to changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling despite the knowledge of the need for change |   | Effort to flex own response to changing demands in the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling when directed to do so                      |   | Independently monitored the professional expectations and interpersonal contexts of professional counseling and flexed own response accordingly                               |
| Was intolerant of unforeseeable or necessary changes in established schedule or protocol   |   | Accepted necessary changes in established schedule or protocol, but without effort to understand the reason for them   |   | Accepted necessary changes in established schedule and attempted to understand needs for them   |

| 7. Willingness to Accept and Use Feedback                                  |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   |
| Discouraged feedback from others through defensiveness and anger           |   | Was generally receptive to supervisory feedback  |   | Invited feedback by direct request and positive acknowledgement when received                         |
| Shown little or no evidence of incorporating supervisory feedback received |   | Shown some evidence of incorporating supervisory feedback into own views and behaviors       |   | Showed evidence of active incorporation of supervisory feedback received into own views and behaviors |
| Perceived feedback contrary to his/her own position as a personal affront  |   | Shown some defensiveness to critique through "over-explanation" of actions but without anger |   | Openly accepted constructive feedback as an opportunity to grow and become a better service provider  |
| Demonstrated greater willingness to give feedback than to receive it       |   | Demonstrated greater willingness to receive feedback than to give it                         |   | Demonstrated a balanced willingness to give and receive supervisory feedback                          |

| 8. Ability to Accept Personal Responsibility<br>Rated from Unable (1) to Able (5) |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1   | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   |
| Refused to admit mistakes or examine own contribution to problems                 |   | Was willing to examine own role in problems when informed of the need to do so                         |   | Monitored own level of responsibility in professional performance   |
| Lied, minimized or embellished the truth to extricate self from problems          |   | Was accurate and honest in describing own and others' roles in problems                                |   | Invited constructive critique from others and applied it toward professional growth   |
| Consistently blamed others for problems without self-examination                  |   | Potential to blame others initially, but later was open to self-examination about own role in problems |   | Accepted own mistakes and responded to them as opportunity for self-improvement, avoided blame in favor of self-examination |

| 9. Ability to Express Feelings Effectively and Appropriately<br>Rated from Unable (1) to Able (5) |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1   | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  |
| Shown no evidence of willingness and ability to articulate own feelings                           |   | Shown some evidence of willingness and ability to articulate own feelings, |   | Was consistently willing and able to articulate the full range of own feelings |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | but with limited range   |  |
| Showed no evidence of willingness and ability to recognize and acknowledge the feelings of others | Showed some evidence of willingness and ability to acknowledge others' feelings—sometimes inaccurate     | Showed willingness and ability to acknowledge others' feelings         |
| Acted out negative feelings (through negative behaviors) rather than articulating them            |  |  |
| Expressions of feelings were inappropriate to the setting   | Expressions of feelings usually appropriate to the setting and was responsive to supervision when not    | Expression of own feelings was consistently appropriate to the setting |
| Was resistant to discussion of own personal feelings in supervision                               | Willing to discuss own feelings in supervision when directed   | Initiated discussion of own feelings in supervision                    |
| Lack of awareness of use of humor inappropriate to the setting                                    | Expression of humor inappropriate to setting but willing to explore and increase awareness when prompted | Use of positive humor to promote resiliency and wellness               |

| 10. Initiative and Motivation<br>Rated from Poor (1) to Good (5) |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   |
| Often missed deadlines and classes                               |   | Missed the maximum allowable classes and deadlines   |   | Met all attendance requirements and deadlines                     |
| Rarely participated in class activities                          |   | Usually participated in class activities             |   | Regularly participated in class activities                        |
| Often failed to meet minimal expectations in assignments         |   | Met only the minimal expectations in assigned work   |   | Met or exceeded expectations in assigned work                     |
| Displayed little or no initiative and creativity in assignments  |   | Showed some initiative and creativity in assignments |   | Consistently displayed initiative and creativity in assigned work |

Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of FACULTY SUPERVISOR

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of STUDENT

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

**Masters of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling**  
**Dr. Jenelle Pitt, Coordinator**

**LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

**1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

The program focused on the area of Ethical Conduct and Professional Identity (Goal 3) specifically examining the extent to which rehabilitation counseling students can articulate an understanding of the ways in which multicultural awareness impacts ethical practice (Objective 3.2). This portion of the assessment utilizes data from Fall 2015 given the SOAP that was initially developed and is on file with the university.

**2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

The instruments used for the assessment were as follows: Rehab 211-Professional Ethical Rubric; Rehab 237-C1, C3, and C6 using the Pre-Practicum Student Evaluation; and Rehab 239-Items C1, C3, and C6-C9 using Internship Student Evaluation.

**3. What did you discover from these data?**

Rehab 211

Rehab 211 (Professional Issues and Ethics in Rehabilitation Counseling) had a total number of 14 students enrolled during Fall 2015. The Professional Ethical Rubric was used to assess student learning outcomes. In the area of **Informed Consent Considerations**, 14 out of 14 students (100%) scored at a level “3” or were considered “accomplished” in being able to demonstrate the nine areas of informed consent as outlined in the Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification [CRCC] 2010), which are as follows: (1) the qualifications, credentials, and relevant experience of the rehabilitation counselor; (2) purposes, goals, techniques, limitations, and the nature of potential risks, and benefits of services; (3) frequency and length of services; (4) confidentiality and limitations regarding confidentiality (including how a supervisor and/or treatment team professional is involved); (5) contingencies for continuation of services upon the incapacitation or death of the rehabilitation counselor; (6) fees and billing arrangements; (7) record preservation and release policies; (8) risks associated with electronic communication; and, (9) legal issues affecting services. Students also were able to integrate various perspectives from class discussions, course text, and field/personal experiences while making connections among professional, cultural, and legal aspects, which is highly encouraged at the graduate level as there is a strong focus on praxis in the program (what does informed consent look like among various populations relative to age, language, race/ethnicity, etc.). Differently stated, 100% of students evaluated during the Fall 2015 semester using the Professional Ethical Rubric were able to demonstrate a high level of cultural complexity, critical thinking, and reflexivity (related to self-awareness, which is an important aspect in developing highly equipped counselors that will work with diverse populations-relates to Objective 3.2 that was being assessed).

In the area of **APA style/formatting** 10 out of 14 students (71%) scored at a level “2” or “capable” (4-6 errors), and 4 out of 14 students (29%) scored at a level “3” or “accomplished” (3 or fewer errors). In the area of **Grammar and Mechanics**, 8 out of 14 (57%) students scored at a

level “2” or were rated as “capable (4-6 errors);” 5 out of 14 students (36%) scored at a level of “3” or “accomplished” (3 or fewer errors) and 1 out of 14 students (7%) was rated at a level “1” or “developing” (more than 6 errors). Though the majority of students were rated in the capable and accomplished range in APA style/formatting and Grammar and Mechanics, as a program we learned that we want to continue to emphasize the importance of a) written communication (critical skill for highly equipped counselors as there is an abundance of case documentation and reports), b) instructor feedback, and c) university resources (such as the Graduate Writing Studio).

#### Rehab 237

Rehab 237 (Case Practices) had a total of 13 students enrolled in Fall 2015 and also includes field experience hours in a rehabilitation counseling setting. The Pre-Practicum Student Evaluation was used to assess student learning outcomes. On item **C1-Understanding and Accepting of Client Values** 9 out of 13 students (69%) scored at a level “5” or “outstanding” described as well above the level of a competent student or new employee by their site supervisor while 4 out of 13 students (31%) were rated at a level “3” or “average” denoted as equal to the standard required of a competent student. We learned that the majority of students are doing well, but we must continue to support students in this area (see Section 4).

On item **C3-Avoids Negative Biases about Clients** 9 out of 13 students (69%) scored at a level “5” (outstanding) or “4” (above average noted as performance being substantially above that required of a competent student or new employee) while 4 out of 13 students (31%) scored at a level of “3” or “average.” We learned that students are doing well overall, but dialogue and reflective exercises/assignments must continue in order to challenge biases of rehabilitation counselors-in-training (see Section 4).

On item **C6-Understands the Relationship of the Client’s Disability to Personal, Social, and Vocational Adjustment** 9 out of 13 students (69%) scored at a level “5” (outstanding), 3 students achieved a level “4” (above average), and 1 student achieved a level “3” (average).

Given the above scores, we learned that students are doing well (majority of students being rated at the outstanding to competent ranges) relative to demonstrating multicultural awareness as a function of ethical practice. We also learned that course assignments, class activities, discussions/dialogues, and guest speakers that partner with the program must continue supporting students in becoming *comfortable* with the *uncomfortable* and embracing dissonance that most often accompanies discussion focused on cultural/professional issues. Closing the loop on the effectiveness of this comes from formal and informal feedback regarding overall courses (student evaluations) and specific assignments (e.g., role play with current professionals from the community that used to be former clients of various service systems in and around the Central Valley; “clients” provide counselors-in-training with real-time feedback).

#### Rehab 239

Rehab 239 (Internship) had a total of 9 students enrolled during Fall 2015. On item **C1-Understanding and Acceptance of Client’s Differences**, 4 out 9 students (44%) were rated at at level “5” or “outstanding” by their site supervisor while 5 out of 9 students (36%) were rated at a level “4” or “above average.” While there is some overlap between item C1 on the internship

and pre-practicum evaluations, students in internship are demonstrating a high degree of ethical behavior particularly in this area of multicultural awareness.

On item **C3-Avoids Over-generalization and the Forming of Stereotypical Attitudes and Behavior Toward Clients**, 4 students (44%) were rated at a level “5” or “outstanding” while 5 students (56%) were rated at a level “4” or above average. Again, we learned that students are doing well in this area and have improved levels of awareness, knowledge, and skills in this area from the pre-practicum stage. This finding is important particularly given the outcomes for individuals with disabilities from diverse backgrounds

On item **C6-Understanding the Relationship of the Particular Disability to Personal, Social, and Vocational Adjustment**, 6 out of 9 students (67%) were rated as either above average or outstanding while 3 students (33%) were rated as average. Taken in to account scores received in Rehab 237 (see page 3), students are continuing to do well in this area of multicultural competence.

On item **C7-Ability to Relate to and Work with Clients Who Have Physical Disabilities**, 7 out of 9 students (78%) were rated as either above average or outstanding while 2 students received scores of N/A or inadequate opportunity to evaluate by their site supervisor. This was a function of the students’ field experience sites as clients had learning disabilities, substance abuse, and mental health disorders. We learned that students are doing well overall in this area, but we can improve in this area as well via class assignments and field experience opportunities incorporated as part of the courses we teach.

On item **C8- Ability to Relate to and Work with Clients who have Mental Disabilities**, 8 out of 9 students (89%) were rated as either “above average” or “outstanding,” while 1 student (11%) was rated as “average.” We found that students are doing well in this area and we are extremely pleased. This finding also supports the national trends of cross-training students to specifically work with individuals diagnosed with mental health needs.

On item **C9-Ability to Relate to and Work with Clients Who Have Emotional Disabilities**, 8 out of 9 students (89%) were rated as either “above average” or “outstanding,” while 1 student (11%) was rated as “average.” We found that students are doing well. This is encouraging particularly given that we are training students to work effectively with a wide range of disability populations.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?**

Full and part-time faculty continue to emphasize content (multicultural competence of which awareness is an aspect) and foundational skills such as written communication. The importance of both are discussed in program faculty meetings, classes, and rehabilitation counseling student association meetings through the faculty advisor. We continue to highlight these points at our program orientation, in student advising/mentoring and professional development meetings throughout the academic year, as well as in our clinical reviews (each student in the program presently undergoes two clinical reviews to evaluate their progress and receive encouragement and support/resources or develop a remediation plan if progress is rated as below average according to the clinical review instrument in use). Evidence-based practices (EBPs) in areas including multicultural competence have been brought into the classroom and program faculty meetings more consistently for discussion as a way of supporting the preparation of highly

trained culturally competent rehabilitation counselors and to help rehabilitation counselors-in-training become more comfortable with consulting the research as they learn to work with real-life clients during their field experiences. More program instructors have begun providing opportunities for professional development points (we try to avoid traditional “extra credit” due to the connotations at the graduate level) if students engage in writing and cultural competent webinars or workshops. Attendance is typically accompanied by a student reflection paper with specific prompts.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-17 academic year?**

According to the SOAP on file with the university, we are scheduled to 1) review/revise comprehensive examination, 2) review/revise Student Pre-Practicum Evaluation, and 3) review/revise Student Internship Evaluation. However, since last year’s report, the program has been approved to seek Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accreditation in an effort to achieve dual accreditation status. As such, we are in the process of pursuing CACREP accreditation and modification of curriculum, comprehensive examination, and evaluation tools will be reviewed.

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

Though we are gearing up for dual accreditation (already Council on Rehabilitation Education [CORE] accredited, now seeking CACREP accreditation), we continue to use comprehensive examination results (student learning outcomes in SOAP are covered on the examination) as a way of measuring progress. During the 2013-2014 academic year (AY), 57% of students achieved a pass rate on the first attempt. In 2014-2015, 63% of students passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. In 2015-2016, 69% of students passed on the first attempt. We are pleased to see the number of students passing on the first attempt and thus demonstrating an increase in achieving learning outcomes. In faculty meetings, we review what content and to what extent is being covered across the curriculum. This also allows us to examine areas that are receiving little to no coverage, so that we can adjust our teaching, assignments, and discussions. Furthermore, while rehabilitation counseling students comprised 5% of the overall sample, the results from the most recent School of Education Graduate Degrees End of the Year Summary indicates that more than 50% of respondents feel extremely prepared when it comes to having an equity mindset in working with clients and more than 70% feel extremely prepared when conducting themselves in accordance with their profession’s ethics and standards.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

**1. What learning outcomes did you assess this 2015-2016 year?**

- a. Outcome 1.1: Graduates will be able to compare and contrast major theories of literacy and language development.
- b. Outcome 1.2: Graduate students will be able to apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons.
- c. Outcome 2.2: Graduate students will be able to provide effective clinical literacy instruction to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse struggling readers.
- d. Outcome 3.1: Graduate students will be able to demonstrate effective collegial mentoring in literacy instruction.

**2. What instruments did you use to assess them in 2015-2016?**

- a. Assessment 1: Theory to Practice Project (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.2): LEE 213 (Teaching Language Arts in Grades K-12) has primary responsibility for assessing these objectives using the Theory to Practice Project rubric. *The LEE 213 Theory to Practice Project* is an inquiry project that has three main components. First, students select a topic of inquiry driven by their professional experiences teaching language arts and write a research paper describing the different theoretical perspectives and respective instructional implications. Second, students use the research examined to develop and implement instructional lessons in the classroom setting. Third, students develop a presentation to share with colleagues that presents the theory of their report, the practical applications from their lessons, and a critical reflection on the experiences. During the spring of 2015, a new faculty member redesigned the Theory to Practice Project rubric and separated the demonstration from the literature review, thus creating two rubrics. However, only the Theory to Practice Presentation results was used for this report. The outcomes are evaluated and scored using a rubric as proficient, developing, and progressing.
- b. Assessment 2: Wiki Literature Review Method (Outcome 1.1, Outcome 3.1): LEE 244 (Research Based Reading Methods) has the primary responsibility for assessing these objectives using *The LEE 244 Wiki Literature Review*. The Wiki Literature Review Method is a review of the research from the emergent reading, comprehension, and English Learner fields of literacy that is then inputted electronically into a Wiki page. On this wiki page, students provide summaries of the research reviewed, including context, methods, and implications as well as a synthesis comparing the various theoretical perspectives that were examined. The outcomes are evaluated and scored using a rubric as excellent (87-100), good (74-86), or satisfactory (below 74) based on the ability to summarize and synthesize research studies.

- c. Assessment 3: Comprehensive Exam (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1) *The LEE 298C Comprehensive Exam* is one of two culminating experience options. It assesses learning outcomes connected to the following core courses: LEE 278, LEE 213, LEE 215, LEE 224, and LEE 244. The core course faculty developed ten questions assessing all the outcomes listed; however, only five of the questions are used every examination period. The graduate students choose three of the five questions to answer. The outcome are evaluated and scored using a 4 point rubric.

### 3. What did you discover from these 2015-2016 results?

- a. Assessment 1: The LEE 213 Theory to Practice Papers are evaluated using 5 criteria (Context, Inquiry Focus & Rationale, Key Findings from Literature, Data Collection & Analysis, Findings, and Reflection/Next Steps) on a 3.0 range: 3 being Proficient, 2 Developing, and 1 Beginning. The evaluation results from the LEE 213 Theory to Practice Papers showed that 50% of the students were able to provide a proficient research context, 83% were able to provide a proficient definition of an inquiry focus, 100% were able to provide a proficient concise overview of key findings from the research literature, 70% were able to proficiently describe the data collected, 83% were proficiently able to describe the findings from their data analysis, and 66% were able to proficiently reflect about the inquiry development.
- b. Assessment 2: The LEE 244 Wiki's are evaluated using 5 criteria (Topics covered, Summary, APA, Attractiveness, and Members & Discussion) on a 3.0 range: 3 being Excellent, 2 being Good, and 1 being Satisfactory. The evaluation results from the LEE 244 Wiki Literature Review Rubric showed that 85% excellently covered 7 or more studies for a total of 5 topics, 71% excellently provided summaries that there excellent in context, 100% of the students used excellent APA reporting procedures, 85% showed excellent attractive wiki's, and 57% had 3 or more members participate in the discussion features.
- c. Assessment 3: Of the five question randomly assigned by Blackboard, the University's software program, graduate students select three to answer. The following chart provides the scores of the 24 graduate students who took the exam in the fall of 2015. The responses were rated on 4.0 scale: 4 being Excellent, 3 being Good, 2 being Satisfactory, and 1 being Unsatisfactory. Graduate students receiving a score below 2.0 had to retake that particular question again.

Table 1: Fall 2015 Comprehensive Examination Results

| Student | 215 | 213 | 244 | 224 | 278 | Results |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| 1       | 3.0 | 3.6 |     |     | 3.0 | Pass    |
| 2       |     | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 |     | Retake  |
| 3       |     | 3.6 |     | 2.2 | 4.0 | Pass    |
| 4       |     |     | 3.6 | 2.2 | 4.0 | Pass    |
| 5       | 4.0 | 3.8 |     |     | 4.0 | Pass    |
| 6       | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 |     |     | Pass    |
| 7       |     | 3.1 | 3.4 | 4.0 |     | Pass    |
| 8       |     | 2.4 | 2.1 | 4.0 |     | Pass    |

|    |     |     |     |     |        |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| 9  |     | 3.8 | 2.3 | 3.0 | Pass   |
| 10 |     | 3.8 | 3.1 | 4.0 | Pass   |
| 11 |     | 4.0 | 2.2 | 3.6 | Pass   |
| 12 | 2.8 | 3.8 |     | 3.8 | Pass   |
| 13 |     | 3.2 |     | 2.4 | Pass   |
| 14 |     | 3.8 | 1.9 | 3.0 | Retake |
| 15 |     | 2.2 | 1.8 | 4.0 | Retake |
| 16 | 1.8 |     | 2.1 | 3.2 | Retake |
| 17 |     |     | 2.0 | 4.0 | Pass   |
| 18 |     | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | Pass   |
| 19 | 2.0 | 3.2 | 2.3 |     | Pass   |
| 20 | 1.0 | 2.2 |     | 2.4 | Retake |
| 21 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.0 |     | Retake |
| 22 |     | 3.6 |     | 2.2 | Pass   |
| 23 |     | 2.6 | 2.3 | 4.0 | Pass   |
| 24 | 3.0 | 2.0 |     | 1.0 | Retake |

**4. What changes did you make as a result of these 2015-2016 findings?**

- a. Since Outcome 1.1 is primarily measured mostly from the LEE 213 Theory to Practice Project Report, it was determined that perhaps this outcome could be triangulated with the data from the LEE 244, Wiki Literature Review.
- b. While the new LEE 213 faculty is a writing expert, the program feels that all faculty need to be providing more models and more scaffolding for the writing process as a result writing support resources were added to the Blackboard classes of LEE 213 and LEE 244. This action will help strengthen the results of outcomes 1.2 and 2.2.
- c. The program was quite pleased with the results of the comprehensive exam to measure Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 3.1. However, it was still determined that the program needs to be more emphasis on analyzing assessments as this was the comprehensive examination question that had the highest retake percentage. As a result, it will become the responsibility of the LEE 224 faculty to ensure that more emphasis is placed on data analysis rather than on assessment administration.
- d. The program noted that the collected data did not provide a clear indication of Outcome 3.1. As a result, the program intends to utilize the KSOEHD exit survey as one of it's outcome measures.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 academic year?**

- a. *LEE 230 Practicum Experience Matrix* (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2)
- b. *LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report*. (Outcomes 3.2)
- c. *LEE 254 Coaching Presentation Rubric* (Outcomes 3.1)
- d. *Comprehensive Exam*. (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)

e. *Alumni Survey* (Outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 3.2)

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review (2015/2015) action plan?**

- Based on our assessment action plan from last year, two graduate students were sent to the Graduate Writing Center. In addition, the redesign of the LEE 213 rubric allowed for emphasis to be placed on research based lesson design.
- We will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports us in sustaining a program of high quality, which was acknowledged and recognized by our external reviewers.

**Learning outcomes assessed**

Across the 2013-2016 academic years, the faculty of the Special Education Credential Program evaluated specific parts of the program. During those years the entire curriculum of our program was revised to address new state standards and to develop a more streamlined and cohesive program that includes the Clear credential and Master's degree coursework in an effort to attract and keep more graduate students through their advanced degrees. The Master of Arts in Special Education had undergone significant review as reflected in the approved SOAP.

The following are the revised performance goals:

**Pedagogy and Universal Access (including Teaching English Learners and Special Populations)**

***Goal 1. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to plan and implement curriculum and instruction.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 1.1: plan instruction based upon appropriate use and interpretations of assessment results, to develop IEP goals and objectives, individual transition plans, and behavior intervention plans, taking into account subject matter, students' prior knowledge of curriculum, linguistic abilities, cultural characteristics, and learning styles.
- 1.2: analyze assessment and performance data from multi-tiered systems of support, universal design for learning, and classroom-based assessments to determine whether to maintain, modify or change specific instructional strategies, curricular content or adaptations, supports and/or daily schedules to facilitate skill acquisition and successful participation for diverse learners
- 1.3: plan and utilize universal design for learning instructional strategies, activities, and content that address diverse student interests, utilize individual strengths, and accommodate various styles of communication and learning, and align with and core curriculum.
- 1.4: implement educational programs that reflect current evidence-based and/or best practices

**Collaboration**

***Goal 2. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to communicate and participate in collaborative educational practices.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

- 2.1: demonstrate effective communication skills in the areas of respectful collaboration, managing conflicts, networking and negotiating, and supervising and training support of paraeducators.

2.2: collaborate and communicate effectively with administrators, school colleagues, support staff, paraeducators, family members, other service providers, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

2.3: collaborate to design, implement, and evaluate educational plans that reflect transition across the life span for all learners.

### Professionalism

***Goal 3. Provide students with knowledge to develop as a professional.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

3.1: apply and reflect on ethical standards to his or her professional conduct

3.2: reflect on his or her own progress, accept professional advice, consider constructive criticism, and engage in critical reflections, open discussion of ideas, and a continuous program of professional development.

### Research

***Goal 4. Provide teacher candidates with knowledge to utilize research to improve instructional practices, classroom management, inclusive strategies, and providing support to students, their teachers and families.***

Graduates of the Special Education Master's Program will be able to:

4.1: design, implement, analyze effect of and reflect on research conducted in a school setting. Student will utilize either an action research or a single subject design

4.2: develop a research proposal in writing and defend it in an oral presentation

4.3: write a literature review in APA style that meets passing rubric score for style/format, content, mechanics, and references.

### **Instruments used to assess the learning outcomes**

- Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate Form
- Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrators/Employer
- Writing Assessment Rubric
- Research Proposal Scoring Guide
- Intervention Project\*/Social Integration Project\*\*
- Project Rubric or Thesis Rubric
- Portfolio Evaluation Rubric
- Candidate Disposition

**Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey – Candidate Form:** This survey is designed to assess whether program graduates believe that goals and objectives of the program are met. The instrument contains (1) a statement of purpose, (2) demographic information, (3) questionnaire examining the level of competency achieved by the Special Education Program graduates and (4) additional comments made by the graduates. This survey is given to each candidate twice; when the candidate exits the Special Education Program at Clear. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3: 3 = well prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 1 = poorly prepared; 0 = no

knowledge/unable to evaluate. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey - Employer/Administrator Form:** This survey intended to examine the quality of the Special Education Program perceived by the administrators or employers who hire our graduates or provide sites for the candidates of our program to complete their final student teaching. This measure consists of 4 sections: (1) a cover letter explaining purposes of survey (2) demographic information (3) questionnaire and (4) additional comments. Practicum Administrator are surveyed twice: When the students have completed their final student teaching at their practicum sites at the end of the Clear credential programs. University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3: 3 = well prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 1 = poorly prepared; 0 = no knowledge/unable to evaluate. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Data collected are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Writing Assessment** - A writing rubric was used to evaluate our candidates' writing, understanding of literature review, and data reporting in SPED 233. Data collected was used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes were made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Research Proposal** –The final project for SPED 243 is a Research Proposal. Students are expected to engage in an iterative process of writing. Students must keep and submit all drafts and group feedback. Data collected was used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

**Intervention Project\*** [Special Education Teaching Sample Project] – In SPED 246, students in the Mild-Moderate credential option complete a comprehensive intervention project. Students are scored on their description of the class context; development of measurable and obtainable goals and objectives and lesson planning; ability to analyze and interpret curriculum-based measurement/progress monitoring assessments to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions; instructional decision-making; and reflection relating instruction and student learning outcomes and identification of professional development goals.

**Social Integration Plan\*\*** –In SPED 247, students in the Moderate-Severe credential option complete a project on which they reflect and identify the ways in which they are supporting the development of social relationships and the active integration of a focus child into classroom and school environments by increasing communication skills. To that end, students complete projects and reflect in three areas: Communication Plan, Communication Matrix, and Picture Exchange Project.

**Portfolio** – Preparing a portfolio is a formative evaluation method requiring on-going data collection and reflection. During the process of preparing their portfolio, students are required reflect upon the evidence they provide. The portfolio consists of three sections: Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms, materials or artifacts demonstrating student competency

and ability to perform as a special education teacher, and the program completion forms. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

**Candidate Dispositions** – The Kremen School of Education and Human Development fosters the development of the following professional dispositions among our candidates: reflection, critical thinking, professional ethics, valuing diversity, collaboration, and life-long learning. Candidates are expected to reflect on these dispositions in their work with students, families, and communities. Multiple evaluative sources are used when assessing our candidate’s dispositions. This examination involves professors, field-based supervisors/ mentors, and employers. The assessment of dispositions begins when candidates enter the program and continues throughout the graduate program at various levels. Assessment results provide feedback to university supervisors, to program instructors, and to the candidate.

## **RESULTS**

### **Evaluation and Needs Assessment – Candidate Level 2/Clear**

#### *Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey*

| In each of the areas of professional responsibility listed below, I feel → |  |
|--|--|
| 1  | I have subject-area expertise  |
| 2  | I have an understanding of student learning needs  |
| 3  | I am able to plan engaging instruction   |
| 4  | I am able to effectively teach all students  |
| 5  | I am able to use assessments to support student learning   |
| 6  | I select/develop appropriate instructional goals   |
| 7  | I make instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and curricular expectations   |
| 8  | I adapt instruction effectively to meet the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings   |
| 9  | I collaboratively develop IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student’s needs (including transition for students age 14 and up) |
| 10   | I implement appropriate instructional strategies and techniques to support individual student needs  |
| 11   | I create and/or maintain a constructive and positive learning environment  |
| 12   | I am able to develop rapport with students   |
| 13   | I have the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.   |
| 14   | I collaborate effectively  |
| 15   | I communicate effectively  |
| 16   | I work well with students’ families  |
| 17   | I effectively utilize technology for a variety of purposes (e.g., instruction, communication, and/or assessment)   |
| 18   | I reflect on my teaching practices   |
| 19   | I demonstrate ethical behavior   |
| 20   | I demonstrate cultural competence  |

### Data

This data from the California State University system-wide Survey of candidates after one year of teaching for academic year 14-15 could not be used as changes made to the survey caused it to be invalid. The survey was revised for the 15-16 school year with a new rubric. Data will not be available until later in Fall 2016.

### Results

The program faculty reviewed the survey data derived from the Survey. The system side survey data is sent to the Dean's office that then sends out disaggregated data by program. Changes were made accordingly to address areas of need. Assessment is stressed across the program; especially related to CBM. Positive behavioral supports are directly assessed in SPED 125 but it also is assessed in SPED 175/176. Although not mentioned in the survey the program has also needed to add MTSS and UDL across the program.

### **Evaluation and Needs Assessment – Administrator/Employer Level 2/Clear**

#### *Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey*

Candidate performance rated by the administrator/employer on a scale of 0-3.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| In each of the areas of professional responsibility listed below, the Clear Credential candidate's preparation is best described as → |   |
| The teacher candidate...  |   |
| 1   | Demonstrates subject-area expertise   |
| 2   | Demonstrates an understanding of student learning needs   |
| 3   | Is able to plan engaging instruction  |
| 4   | Is able to effectively teach all students   |
| 5   | Is able to use assessments to support student learning  |
| 6   | Selects/develops appropriate instructional goals  |
| 7   | Makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and curricular expectations   |
| 8   | Adapts instruction effectively to meet the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings   |
| 9   | Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (including transition for students age 14 and up) |
| 10  | Implements appropriate instructional strategies and techniques to support individual student needs  |
| 11  | Creates and/or maintains a constructive and positive learning environment   |
| 12  | Develops rapport with students  |
| 13  | Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.  |
| 14  | Collaborates effectively  |
| 15  | Communicates effectively  |
| 16  | Works well with students' families  |
| 17  | Effectively utilizes technology for a variety of purposes (e.g., instruction, communication, and/or assessment)   |

|    |                                  |
|----|----------------------------------|
| 18 | Reflects on his/her practices    |
| 19 | Demonstrates ethical behavior    |
| 20 | Demonstrates cultural competence |

### Data

University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district administrators/employers during the candidate’s last semester of final practicum. The response rate from the administrator/employer varies from year to year. Previous data from 2013 and 2014 are not available. For 2015-2016, the data are shown below.

Scale 1-3 [0 = no knowledge/unable to evaluate; 1 = poorly prepared; 2 = moderately well prepared; 3 = well prepared.] Scores of 2 and 3 meet the requirement.

|             | # surveys returned | Mean |
|-------------|--------------------|------|
| Fall 2015   | 5                  | 2.80 |
| Spring 2016 | 8                  | 2.85 |

Overall rating by Administrator/Employer [Dissatisfied; Satisfied; Very Satisfied; Unable to Evaluate] yielded an overall mean rating of Very Satisfied.

### Results

The data show that the program is effective overall and that district administrators/employers are satisfied to very satisfied with the university candidates they hire. This indicates that the program is producing positive results. An area to address is the relatively low numbers of surveys returned. The number of surveys returned are affected by three variables: (1) whether the student has been offered and accepted a teaching position during final practicum, (2) whether the district administrator/employer returns the survey to the university, and (3) whether the survey is returned to the Coordinator or placed in the student’s cumulative record. The program will develop an electronic survey of the descriptors and overall rating for the district administrator/employer to complete. If possible, the survey will be designed to collate the responses from the district administrators/employers after responses are entered.

### Writing Assessment

#### Writing Assessment Rubric

|                  | <b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b>   | <b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b>  | <b>DEVELOPING (2):</b>  | <b>BEGINNING (1):</b>   |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Style and Format | Follow all requirements for (3) and flows smoothly from one idea to another. Writer has made effort | APA, double space, models language and conventions of scholarly literature, style contributes to comprehensibility, models discipline’s | Some APA, lacks consistent style, unclear which citation is for which statement. Overuses quotes, significant | APA not followed; not thorough or competent; lack of clarity and coherence; writer’s focus interferes with clear communication. |

|                          |  |  |   |   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                          | to assist the reader in following logic of ideas.  | style.   | revisions needed.   |   |
| Mechanics                | <b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b><br>Follow all requirements for (3) and error free, writing flows, transitions support and follow writer's logic.   | <b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b><br>Sentences and words are chosen to clearly communicate ideas. Minor errors, conventions followed, comprehensible, transitions and subheading are clear.                                     | <b>DEVELOPING (2):</b><br>Frequent errors in spelling or grammar/verb agreement, comprehensibility difficult, writing not smooth.   | <b>BEGINNING (1):</b><br>Numerous spelling and grammar errors, logic of paper difficult to follow. Sentence structure interferes with clarity.                      |
| Content and Organization | <b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b><br>Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important issues, good basis for further research. Includes interview with scholar on the field. | <b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b><br>All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, interesting paper, creditable summarization of related literature. Includes correspondence with scholar on the topic | <b>DEVELOPING (2):</b><br>Lacking in substantial ways, poorly focused, scholarly argument weak, major ideas inadequate, content and organization needs significant revisions. No correspondence or interview. | <b>BEGINNING (1):</b><br>Scholarly review of literature inadequate, content poorly focused, lacks organization, reader left with little understanding of the topic. |
| Literature Review        | <b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b><br>Current and emerging research is cited. Citations largely peer reviewed journals reporting original research. APA style refs without errors                         | <b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b><br>All substantial statements referenced. Few secondary references. Very few quotes used. Variety of sources. APA style refs w/minimal errors.  | <b>DEVELOPING (2):</b><br>Frequent secondary references. Large use of quotations. Low variety of sources, little use of original research reports. Dozen APA reference errors or more.                        | <b>BEGINNING (1):</b><br>Secondary or no references. Largely report of opinions. Little use of original research reports.   |

|                |  |   |   |  |
|----------------|--|---|---|--|
| Relevant Topic | <b>EXEMPLARY (4):</b><br>Topic relevant to profession and the student's professional work. | <b>ACCOMPLISHED (3):</b><br>Topic is relevant to profession in general but not the student's professional practice. | <b>DEVELOPING (2):</b><br>Topic interesting and related to education in some vague way. | <b>BEGINNING (1):</b><br>Topics include reality television, celebrities, politics, or astrology. |
|----------------|--|---|---|--|

Data

| SPED 233                | # Ss | Score Mean | Score Max | Score Range |
|-------------------------|------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Fall 2013               | 22   | 182.7      | 200       | 152-200     |
| Spring 2014 (section 1) | 19   | 93.11      | 100       | 80-99       |
| Spring 2014 (section 2) | 19   | 93.53      | 100       | 88-98       |

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to a rubric to provide better more descriptive information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

| SPED 233    | # Ss | Style & Format/APA | Mechanics | Content & Organization |
|-------------|------|--------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Fall 2015   | 12   | 3.0                | 3.2       | 3.1                    |
| Spring 2016 | 21   | 2.8                | 3.1       | 3.0                    |

Results

The writing assessment results have shown that the writing assignment needs to provide more support in APA style and format. Although multiple classes, handouts, and activities cover APA it often happens only in this class. During a program retreat, SPED faculty agreed to use APA references and style in course assignments across the program. As a result, faculty will provide this additional APA support and will strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Fresno State Graduate Writing Center.

## Research Proposal

### *Project Proposal Evaluation Rubric*

#### **QUALITY INDICATORS**

##### **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**

- Introduction to the study has a clear statement of the problem, demonstrating how topic is significant to area of study and professional organization.
- Introduction situates specific problem within a broader context.
- The research questions/ hypothesis are stated clearly.
- Assumptions, limitations, and bounds of the study are clearly stated.
- Important terms are defined conceptually and operationally.

##### **CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

- Coverage of the literature is adequate and within scope of problem.
- Literature review is well organized around major ideas or themes.
- The content of the review is drawn from the most relevant published knowledge and current research on the topic under investigation.
- Scholarly sources, such as books, peer-reviewed journals, or other materials appropriate to the issue or problem are chosen for study.
- There is a literature-based description of the research variables or potential themes and perceptions to be investigated.
- The literature review makes explicit connections between prior knowledge and research and the issue or problem under investigation

##### **CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY**

- The research design is appropriate and described fully.
- The role of the researcher is clearly explained.
- The research setting is described and justified.
- Population, sample, criteria for selecting sample/participants, and access to subjects/participants are appropriate and described in adequate detail.
- The process to generate, gather and record data is explained in detail.
- Data gathering methods and procedures are appropriate and clearly described.
- The systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (logs, reflective journals, cataloging) clearly described.
- Description of instrumentation or data collection tools is present.
- Measures for ethical protections and rights of participants are adequate.
- Data analysis methods and procedures are clearly described.

##### **OVERALL PRESENTATION: STYLE AND FORMAT:**

###### APA Style:

- The proposal must conform to the guidelines for style as set forth in the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA Manual).

This includes but is not limited to:

- correct grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
- proper in-text citations for references, direct quotations, and paraphrasing.
- the reference list.
- all tables and figures.

**QUALITY INDICATORS**

- headings and sub-headings.

The writing:

- is scholarly (i.e., the language is accurate, balanced, specific rather than overly general,
- tentative regarding conclusions, grounded in previous scholarship and evidence).
- is direct and precise.
- is clear and comprehensible, without excessive jargon.
- paragraphs focus on a main point and all sentences within the paragraph relate to the main point.
- transition sentences are used to bridge main ideas.

The paper:

- is organized logically and comprehensively.
- has headings and subheadings to identify the logic and movement of the project and make it easy for the reader to follow.

**Overall Project Proposal Assessment Score**

27- 30 points – Approved with Commendation, Exceptional Level of Scholarship

24- 26 points - Approved as Written

21- 23 points – Approved with Minor Revisions

20 points or less - Fail/Requires Revision & Resubmission of Specified Categories/Chapter (s)

Data

| SPED 243    | # S s               | Mean | Max |
|-------------|---------------------|------|-----|
| Fall 2013   | 4                   | 70   | 70  |
| Spring 2014 | Data not available. |      |     |

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

| SPED 243  | # Ss | Introduction | Review of Literature | Methodology and Discussion | Style and Format/APA |
|-----------|------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Mean 2015 | 13   | 3.2          | 3.4                  | 2.6                        | 3.2                  |
| Mean 2016 | 6    | 3.2          | 3.2                  | 2.67                       | 3.2                  |

Results

Faculty reviewed the mean scores and noted the lowest scores fell in the methodology section. The vast majority of special education candidates’ research, write, and create projects, which do not require such things as sampling, a research design, and gathering data. The scores reflect this.

Faculty agreed to provide support in the gathering and use of data through other assignments such as the Research Design Assignment in SPED 233 and will also strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Graduate Writing Studio and the Graduate Net Initiative.

### **Intervention Project [Mild/Moderate Credential Candidates]**

#### *Intervention Project Rubric*

| <b>Part</b>   | <b>Description</b>  |
|---|---|
| Part 1: Students receiving Special Education Services | In this section you will choose one or a small group of students with identified disabilities in language arts and/or mathematics. Identify one or more of the categories under which the student(s) qualify for special education services as defined by IDEA. You will choose to address the students' instructional needs/IEP Objectives in mathematics or language arts. Identify any processing disorder(s) and discuss how you will tailor instruction to meet the needs of the learner. Based upon the information collected, develop a plan for behavior management/motivation including expectations, accountability, and positive reinforcement. [25 points possible] |
| Part 2: Design for Instruction                        | In this section you will develop measureable, attainable, short-term goals and a series of lesson objectives, including the CA Essential Standards addressed, based upon the chosen deficits/IEP Objective(s). You will deliver 8-10 days of intervention matched to student skill deficit or 8-10 days of differentiated instruction using State Board of Education (SBE) core curriculum. You will include a detailed description of the instructional design (i.e., lesson plans), including teacher demonstration, explicit instruction, and structured, guided, and independent practice. [25 points possible]   |
| Part 3: Curriculum-based Measurement                  | In this section you will administer curriculum-based measurements for the purposes of evaluating the efficacy of your instruction. You will administer 3 CBMs to establish a baseline, then 3 more throughout the intervention, to track student progress. Copies of dated, scored probes are to be included in the project. You will demonstrate your ability to analyze and interpret the curriculum-based measurement to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions. [25 points possible]   |
| Part 4: Instructional Decision-Making                 | In this section you will describe examples of instructional decisions made during the project based on curriculum-based measurement, student responses, pacing, teaching to mastery, and student motivation. [25 points possible]   |
| Part 5: Reflection & Self-Evaluation                  | In this section you will reflect upon the relationship between your instruction and student learning outcomes. Describe specific strategies and/or curriculum used and the relationship to student success. Develop professional development goals based upon the experience of the project. [25 points]  |

## Data

Fall 2013

| <b>SPED 246</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Part 1          | 18          | 24.62       | 26         | 1-26         |
| Part 2          | 18          | 23.06       | 25         | 19-25        |
| Part 3          | 18          | 34.67       | 38         | 20-38        |
| Part 4 & 5      | 18          | 50.44       | 51         | 41-51        |

Spring 2014

| <b>SPED 246</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Part 1          | 21          | 23.87       | 26         | 20-26        |
| Part 2          | 21          | 23.52       | 25         | 17.5-25      |
| Part 3          | 21          | 36.43       | 38         | 20.5-38      |
| Part 4          | 21          | 24.76       | 25         | 20-25        |
| Part 5          | 21          | 24.51       | 26         | 5-26         |

*NOTE: In Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, the Coordinator was on leave, and two faculty were on sabbatical. No data collected for 14-15.*

Fall 2015

| <b>SPED 246</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Part 1          | 9           | 24.44       | 26         | 21-26        |
| Part 2          | 9           | 23.5        | 25         | 20-25        |
| Part 3          | 9           | 32.83       | 38         | 22-38        |
| Part 4          | 9           | 24.44       | 25         | 20-25        |
| Part 5          | 9           | 24.83       | 26         | 18.50-26     |

Spring 2016

| <b>SPED 246</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Part 1          | 14          | 23          | 26         | 20-26        |
| Part 2          | 14          | 22.21       | 25         | 14-22.1      |
| Part 3          | 14          | 36          | 38         | 30-38        |
| Part 4          | 14          | 24.79       | 25         | 22-25        |
| Part 5          | 14          | 25.79       | 26         | 23-26        |

## Results

The data show that from 2013 to 2016, the writing performance in the content areas decreased slightly. As a result, faculty will provide additional instruction in writing to content and will strongly encourage candidates to make use of the Fresno State Graduate Writing Center. During the program retreat, faculty agreed to use APA references and style in course assignments across the program.

## Social Integration Project [Moderate/Severe Credential Candidates]

### Data

*NOTE: This course is offered once per year.*

Spring 2014

| <b>SPED 247</b>              | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Communication Plan           | 18          | 69.83       | 75         | 45-75        |
| Communication Matrix Project | 18          | 99.17       | 120        | 45-120       |
| Picture Exchange Project     | 18          | 331.94      | 30         | 255-370      |

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

Spring 2016

| <b>SPED 247</b>              | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Max</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Communication Plan           | 8           | 280.25      | 300        | 235.5-300    |
| Communication Matrix Project | 8           | 92.50       | 100        | 80-100       |
| Picture Exchange Project     | 8           | 260.44      | 273        | 225-273      |

### Results

The results are inclusive due to the differing data score maximums used. Faculty noted that there was student improvement, though that is difficult to quantify. Different part-time lecturers taught the course in each semester and appear to have used different point values to measure the same assignments. Program faculty need to ensure that signature assignments and measurements remain the same across reporting years to ensure accurate reporting and analysis of data. In addition, it is recommended that faculty convert evaluation results to a rubric scale to derive comparable scores in each area.

### Master's Project/Thesis

#### *Project Rubric*

**1. Primary trait:** The Graduate student has clearly stated the problem addressed and purpose of his/her project.

#### **Scoring rubric:**

- 1) Problem/purpose not discernible from the text, or so confused so as to violate scientific principles.
- 2) Problem/purpose discernible, but not stated in testable form; contextual connections vague.
- 3) Problem/purpose recognized and well stated; contextual connections clear.
- 4) Problem/purpose clearly stated and well crafted in an elegantly testable form; Hypothesis/objectives made with very clear contextual connection.

**2. Primary trait:** The review of relevant literature provides a historical context and comprehensive perspective of the topic.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) The review does not adequately demonstrate the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field.
- 2) The review adequately demonstrates the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field but contains errors.
- 3) The review is well written and demonstrates the relationship between the project and current best practice in the field.
- 4) The review is very well written, demonstrates a relationship between the project and current best practice, and provides a comprehensive perspective of the topic.

**3. Primary trait:** The summary/recommendations/conclusions section clearly provides implications of the literature and a rationale for the project.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) Procedures are vague, disorganized, and/or are filled with irrelevant information.
- 2) Procedures are unclear but interpretable. Some irrelevant information interferes.
- 3) Procedures are easily interpreted. Relevant information dominates.
- 4) Procedures are so clear that they require no additional interpretation and could be used directly as protocol. Appropriate details are provided.

**4. Primary trait:** The project component clearly integrates current results with previous scientific knowledge.

**Scoring rubric:**

- 1) The project component merely replicates other materials and is unlikely to be used by the author or others.
- 2) The project component weakly integrates new information and lacks a dissemination component.
- 3) The project component critically integrates new information and is likely to be useful to others in the field.
- 4) The project component creatively integrates new information, is likely to be used by others and has a clear dissemination component.

Data

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

| SPED 298    | # Ss | Mean |
|-------------|------|------|
| Fall 2013   | 10   | 3.56 |
| Spring 2014 | 10   | 3.5  |

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

In 2015-2016, program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below. Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary]. Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

| <b>SPED 298/99</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Problem &amp; Purpose</b> | <b>Relevant Literature &amp; Comprehensive Perspective</b> | <b>Discussion &amp; Recommendation</b> | <b>Integrates Current Results with Previous Knowledge</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Fall 2015          | 7           | 3.71                         | 3.41   | 3.57                                   | 3.57  |
| Spring 2016        | 12          | 3.75                         | 3.42   | 3.58                                   | 3.50  |

Results

Based on the data, candidates successfully complete their Master’s Projects competently. Faculty will continue to support candidates in the completion of their projects.

**Portfolio**

*Portfolio Evaluation Rubric*

| <b>SPED 236</b>   | <b>EXEMPLARY [4]</b>   | <b>ACCOMPLISHED [3]</b>  | <b>DEVELOPING [2]</b>   | <b>LIMITED [1-0]</b>   |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms   | Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important issues, excellent basis for further self-evaluation.            | All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, raises important issues, good basis for further self-evaluation. | Incomplete poorly focused sections, major ideas inadequate, needs revisions, little basis for further self-evaluation.                            | Incomplete forms, major ideas missing in any section, needs major revisions, little or no basis for further self-evaluation. |
| Materials or Artifacts Demonstrating Student Competency | Follow all requirements for (3). Materials or artifacts relate directly to competencies and teaching and are not repeated over competencies. | All requirements followed. Materials or artifacts relate directly to competencies and teaching and are repeated across 2 competencies. | All requirements followed. Some materials or artifacts do not relate directly to competencies and teaching or are repeated across 3 competencies. | Many materials or artifacts do not relate directly to competencies and teaching or are repeated across 4 competencies.       |
| Program Completion Forms                                | Follow all requirements for (3) and excels in organization, raises important   | All requirements followed, major points found and logically arranged, raises important   | Incomplete poorly focused sections, major ideas inadequate,   | Incomplete forms, major ideas missing in any section, needs major  |

issues, excellent basis for further self-evaluation.    issues, good basis for further self-evaluation.    needs revisions, little basis for further self-evaluation.    revisions, little or no basis for further self-evaluation.

Data

| SPED 236    | # Ss | Mean  | Max | Range    |
|-------------|------|-------|-----|----------|
| Fall 2013   | 18   | 92.26 | 100 | 70-100   |
| Spring 2014 | 14   | 88.19 | 100 | 18.5-100 |
| Fall 2014   | 9    | 89.62 | 100 | 21-100   |
| Spring 2015 | 10   | 93.47 | 100 | 88-100   |

*NOTE: In 2015, two faculty on sabbatical and one faculty out on parental leave. Only one of the four tenure track faculty were working.*

In 2015-2016, the rubric was revised to follow a 4-point scale. Program faculty agreed to change the assessment scoring to provide more information for program improvement. The changes are noted in the scoring below.

Scale 1-4 [1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary].  
Scores of 3 and 4 meet the requirement.

| SPED 236    | # Ss | Individualized Induction Plan | Materials or Artifacts Demonstrating Student Competency | Program Completion Forms |
|-------------|------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Fall 2015   | 17   | 3.0                           | 3.46  | 3.37                     |
| Spring 2016 | 8    | 3.55                          | 3.6   | 3.8                      |

Results

Faculty reviewed the data and noted that developing a professional and reflective Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) was a challenge area based on the minimally accomplished score. The IIP requires candidates to evaluate their own professional strengths and growth areas and to develop an action plan to address this. Faculty will provide more directed and targeted support and encouragement in the development of the IIP and will work with the receiving district support providers to assist in the improvement.

**Candidate Dispositions – Level 2/Clear**

*Candidate Dispositions Rubric [Candidate Self-Evaluates]*

**DISPOSITION: Reflection**

Applies, assesses, reflects upon, and adjusts instructional strategies to advance student learning. Accepts and incorporates suggestions in subsequent practice. Demonstrates self-analysis regarding one’s own strengths and weaknesses. Ability to see one’s own contribution to identified challenges in the classroom and to make changes as needed.

**DISPOSITION: Critical Thinking**

Utilizes assessment data to adjust instruction, choice of curriculum and methods of evaluation. Candidate's work (e.g., case studies, group process evaluations, article critiques) indicates an ability to identify problems and solutions.

Intentionally applies and encourages higher order thinking skills, such as analysis, synthesis, problem recognition and problem solving with students in the classroom.

Solicits and gives thoughtful consideration to alternative and contradictory opinions.

Inquiring, creative, seeks solutions

---

**DISPOSITION: Professional ethics**

Recognizes the importance of consulting research to inform instruction for students with special needs

Shows commitment to ethical conduct: turns in assignments on time, is punctual and reliable in attendance, maintains professional appearance

Utilizes positive behavioral supports when managing student behavior.

Actively advocates for students and encourages student self-advocacy.

Utilizes non-biased assessments.

---

**DISPOSITION: Valuing Diversity**

Diagnoses learners' needs by interpreting data from diverse sources (e.g., formal/informal assessments, student behavior and feedback, and parent responses)

Develops lessons that are interesting and engaging utilizing a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate all learners, including those from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and cultures.

Facilitates the academic and social inclusion of students with special needs in various inclusive activities and environments.

Differentiates instruction to allow students who differ widely in terms of their background, knowledge, learning styles/preferences, and orientation to school norms to reach common standards.

---

**DISPOSITION: Collaboration**

Demonstrates the ability to work creatively and collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and the community.

Values families as full partners in the educational process

Collaborates with general education teachers in the modification of instruction, curriculum and assessment of students with special needs.

Communicates on a regular basis the progress of students with special needs to parents and general education teachers.

Plans and collaborates to ensure that appropriate supports for smooth transitions are in place.

---

**DISPOSITION: Life-long Learning**

Seeks out opportunities for professional development (e.g., attendance at workshops, inservice trainings, conferences, membership in professional organizations) using the information learned to improve teaching practice.

Seeks out opportunities to serve the school, students, and community (e.g., extracurricular activities, Big Brothers, Big Sisters).

Demonstrates a positive attitude toward learning, intellectual and academic curiosity.

Presents on an area of expertise or interest to teachers and/or parents at local, state, national or international conferences or trainings.

## Data

Scale 1-4 [1 = no/limited evidence/application, 2 = some evidence/application 3 = satisfactory evidence/application, 4 = exceptional evidence/application]

Target is scores of 3 and 4.

| <b>SPED<br/>235/236</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Reflection</b>  | <b>Critical<br/>Thinking</b> | <b>Professio<br/>nal Ethics</b> | <b>Valuing<br/>Diversity</b> | <b>Collabora<br/>tion</b> | <b>Life-Long<br/>Learning</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Spring<br>2014          | 12          | 3.60               | 3.52                         | 3.80                            | 3.59                         | 3.69                      | 3.31                          |
| Fall 2014               | 8           | Data not available |                              |                                 |                              |                           |                               |
| Spring<br>2015          | 9           | 3.70               | 3.60                         | 3.75                            | 3.64                         | 3.31                      | 3.38                          |

| <b>SPED<br/>235/236</b> | <b># Ss</b> | <b>Reflection</b> | <b>Critical<br/>Thinking</b> | <b>Professio<br/>nal Ethics</b> | <b>Valuing<br/>Diversity</b> | <b>Collabora<br/>tion</b> | <b>Life-Long<br/>Learning</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Fall 2015               | 13          | 3.31              | 3.12                         | 3.4                             | 3.61                         | 3.42                      | 3.39                          |
| Spring<br>2016          | 8           | 3.33              | 3.39                         | 3.6                             | 3.42                         | 3.33                      | 3.42                          |

## Results

The dispositions are addressed in coursework throughout our credential program. Upon the completion of the Professional Clear coursework, each candidate completes a self-evaluation on the Candidate Dispositions form. The results show that over time candidates perceive themselves as slightly decreasing in competence in all areas except Life-long Learning. This may due in part to changes in the Professional Clear program admission criteria. Previously, credential candidates enrolled in the Professional Clear coursework as part of their credential program at Fresno State. Recently, candidates from universities other than Fresno State have been admitted to the Professional Clear program and may be entering without the skills to feel competent in many areas of the dispositions. In addition, it is known (Futernich, 2007) that teachers in their first and second year of teaching are facing many challenges and this may reflect their employment circumstances, support, or even their greater insight into the professions' expectations. Regardless of the reason for the slightly decreasing scores, the mean in each dispositional area is still well above satisfactory. Faculty will continue to address the dispositions in signature assignments throughout all coursework.

### **4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?**

Faculty in the SPED program will continue to meet monthly and more often when needed to address issues and make changes. Across the SOAP years, the program made many changes in signature assignments and data collection. Changes made based on the results of assessment activities will be documented in meeting minutes for program review. Data collection should be a meaningful routine and on-going process in Special Education Program for improvement purposes.

Changes based on results:

- New rubrics developed for SPED 233 and SPED 243
- Assignment changes made in SPED 219 to reflect best /researched proven practices in family collaboration and support
- APA expectations and instructions infused across the program
- Methodology Assignment revised to provide more support in SPED 243
- Individual Induction Plan development provided more structure and instruction. IIP also improved for support from district support provider.
- Three MA tracks developed to meet the needs of students who transfer with a credential and international students. Approval process through the Kremen School and will be at the Graduate committee level in Fall 2016

For the future SOAP faculty in the SPED program will meet at least once a month as a program and more often when needed to address issues and make changes. These are suggested changes:

1. Develop a streamlined method of data collection system in an online collaborative document. Data collection should be a meaningful routine and on-going process in Special Education Program for improvement purposes.
2. Revision of the program to meet new state credential standards/requirements (link to CCTC - clear)
3. Implementation of new courses and signature assignments (link to courses)
4. Updating the website (link to website)
5. Improving recruitment and advising documents [link to Kremen website- Special Education- advising forms]
6. Increasing the use and the student's skills in technology through the use of tablets and phones to collect data and share results, Blackboard, and other applications.
7. Increasing student involvement in research – SPED 243 was a new course in the 2013-2106 SOAP developed to scaffold and improve the students' use of research in instruction as well as in class assignments. The program identified key research to be shared with the candidates in the MA program. Students participated in local presentations and the Grad EXPO. In addition during these years three students entered doctoral programs: UT Austin, Ohio State, and CSU San Diego. This work needs to continue.

**Masters of Arts in Education – Early Childhood Education**  
**Dr. Cathy K. Yun, Coordinator**

**LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

**1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

Goal 1: ECE graduates utilize theory, research, and ongoing assessment when making instructional decisions.

SLO 1.1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions that promote development and learning.

SLO 1.2. Apply current ECE research to issues of practice.

SLO 1.3. Utilize a variety of inquiry methods and the latest technology.

Goal 2: ECE graduates are caring and ethical teacher-leaders, guided by their knowledge of culturally and developmentally appropriate practices.

SLO 2.1. Engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment and life-long learning.

Goal 3: ECE graduates are leaders who address the needs of their culturally diverse learners respectfully and responsively.

SLO 3.1. Integrate various perspectives to create quality early education for all children.

SLO 3.2. Be responsive to ethnical, cultural and linguistic diversity.

Goal 4: Develop interprofessional skills necessary to become ECE leaders in both the educational community and in the community at large.

SLO 4.1. Build strong relationships with families and communities.

SLO 4.2. Advocate for children, families, and the profession.

**2. What instruments (assignment) did you use to assess them?**

Six assessments were used to evaluate student performance relative to the four goals:

- Assessment 1: Project/Thesis or Comprehensive Exam evaluated Goal 1  
All of the options for Assessment 1 (i.e., Comprehensive Examination, Project, Thesis, Specialist Research Paper) require a theoretical framing and demonstration of the candidate's understanding of theory and research regarding young children's characteristics and needs, from birth through age 8. In addition, candidates must be able to discuss the multiple influences on early development and learning, including diverse family and community characteristics. Candidates must demonstrate the ability to use research-based concepts and appropriate inquiry tools related to content areas, academic disciplines, development, and/or the early childhood field to craft and provide evidence for a coherent argument or stance.
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio evaluated Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4  
The ECE Field Portfolio assessment requires students to document and organize the cumulative evidence of their ability to apply as NAEYC's Standards and Key Elements in order to demonstrate growth as an ECE professional in their identified specialization: Teacher Leader or Program Leader. Students are directed to include evidence from ECE

graduate studies, fieldwork, and professional experiences. In doing so, students address the NAEYC Advanced Standards and Key Elements. The scope of this assessment is intentionally broad in order to scaffold students' learning and accountability to a level of synthesis. Students must "put it all together," in order to make the necessary connections between seemingly discreet curricula and experiences.

- Assessment 3: Charter School Project evaluated Goals 1 and 3  
The DAP Charter School Project makes real the ideals of developmentally and culturally appropriate practices (DAP) and a quality, comprehensive ECE program spanning birth through third grade. Candidates design a curriculum and assessment plan for a charter school, based in research-based, developmentally appropriate practices. In their plans, candidates must demonstrate cultural competence and effective collaboration to involve families and communities in young children's development and learning.
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity evaluated Goal 4  
The ECE Leadership Activity requires students to design a community-based activity to enhance ECE quality based in their ECE practice. This activity is a critical demonstration of the candidate's ability to provide effective professional leadership grounded in research and best practice, and to be an advocate for children and families.
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity evaluated Goal 1  
The Action Research Project provides students the opportunity to engage in reflective practice by exploring an action research question through application of theory, a review of the literature, and approved action research methodology. The project includes development of an assessment plan, implementation of an evidence-based practice, and connection of assessment and practice to theory.
- Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity evaluated Goals 2, 3, and 4  
The Dispositions and Ethics Assignment requires students to analyze and respond to a series of ECE case studies with regard to developmentally appropriate practices, culturally sustaining pedagogy and practices, and professional and ethical conduct. Candidates are required to incorporate references to the NAEYC *Code of Ethical Conduct*.

(Assessment rubrics available at [https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B\\_3-LzrR-M4qZVNxRXJuX0RGMGc&usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B_3-LzrR-M4qZVNxRXJuX0RGMGc&usp=sharing))

### 3. What did you discover from the data?

Relative to Goal 1, there were mixed assessment results. Analysis of the Action Research Project (Assessment 5) indicates a relative strength for all students in their ability to utilize a variety of inquiry methods as well as competency in their ability to apply theory and current research to issues of practice ( $n = 12$ ,  $M = 22.58/24$ ,  $\text{min} = 19/24$ ,  $\text{max} = 24/24$ ). Most students who completed a Project/Thesis/Comprehensive Exam (Assessment 1) demonstrated at an adequate level their ability to apply current research to issues of practice ( $n = 9$ ,  $M = 9.04/12$ ,  $\text{min} = 8/12$ ,  $\text{max} = 11/12$ ). One student failed to pass the Comp Exam after three tries. She was referred for evaluation and she will be retaking the exam in Fall 2016, with support from the Services for Students with Disabilities office.

Relative to Goal 2, the Field Portfolio (Assessment 2) indicates students are able to engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment, and life-long learning at a high level ( $n = 11$ ,  $M =$

27.64/30, min = 20/30, max = 30/30). The Dispositions and Ethics Activity (Assessment 6) demonstrated that students were able to engage in self-reflection to connect their practice with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Professional Code of Ethics for the ECE field at an adequate level (n = 13, M = 11.46/15, min = 10/15, max = 15/15).

Relative to Goal 3, the Portfolio (Assessment 2) indicates that ECE students are strong with regard to addressing the needs of their culturally diverse learners in a respectful and responsible manner as indicated by their ability to integrate various perspectives and to be responsive to ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity. This demonstration of strength on the Portfolio was corroborated by students' performances on the Charter School project (Assessment 3) (n = 10, M = 14.20/15, min = 12/15, max = 15/15)

Relative to Goal 4, students' performances were adequate in the areas of leadership and advocacy as measured by the Leadership Activity (Assessment 4) (n = 9, M = 12.44/15, min = 10/15, max = 15/15) and the Portfolio (Assessment 2). Scores on the Dispositions and Ethics Activity (Assessment 6) also showed that students were able to recognize the importance of building relationships with families and communities as well as advocate for children, with adequate competency.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of the data?**

All assessment instruments and rubrics were revised and updated in 2014-15 based on ongoing data interpretation and in response to accreditation requirements.

1. Goal 1: In 2015-16, the Comprehensive Exam (Assessment 1) prompts were examined and faculty began the process of revising and adding to the exam prompts. Each faculty member created one or two additional prompts to add to the pool. 2016-17 plans include rigorous examination of the new prompts and how they align with the NAEYC standards, SOAP SLOs, and exam rubric. We also plan to develop a more systematized process for randomly selecting prompts for each exam administration.
2. Goal 2: The new Dispositions and Ethics Activity (Assessment 6) and rubric were piloted. 2016-17 plans include examination of the pilot data and discussion of whether the assessment and/or rubric needs to be refined or revised. This work will be performed collaboratively in program meetings.
3. Goal 3: The revised Charter School Project (Assessment 3) and rubric were piloted in 2015-16. 2016-17 plans include examination of the pilot data and discussion of whether the assessment and/or rubric needs to be further refined.
4. Goal 4: The revised Field Portfolio (Assessment 2) and the Leadership Activity (Assessment 4) assessments and rubrics were piloted 2015-16. 2016-17 plans include examination of the pilot data and discussion of whether the assessment and/or rubric needs to be further refined.

#### **5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?**

Six assessments will be used to evaluate student performance relative to the four goals:

- Assessment 1: Project/Thesis or Comprehensive Exam will evaluate Goal 1
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio will evaluate Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4

- Assessment 3: Charter School Project will evaluate Goals 1 and 3
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity will evaluate Goal 4
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity will evaluate Goal 1
- Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity will evaluate Goals 2, 3, and

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

In 2015-16, the Comprehensive Exam prompts were examined and faculty began the process of revising and adding to the exam prompts. Each faculty member created one or two additional prompts to add to the pool. For Assessments 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, revised assessments and rubrics were piloted in 2015-16. The new shared database for access and documentation of assessment data was implemented. Two database training workshops for all program faculty were conducted by the program coordinator. Four out of seven faculty members used the new system in 2015-16. Feedback was positive and use of the new system will be continued in 2016-17. The procedure for entering data will be examined and a different strategy will be tested. In 2015-16 faculty were asked to enter their assessment data independently. In 2016-17, we will try having all faculty bring their assessment data to a program meeting and enter the data during the meeting.

Assessment rubrics available at [https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B\\_3-LzrR-M4qZVNxRXJuX0RGMGc&usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B_3-LzrR-M4qZVNxRXJuX0RGMGc&usp=sharing)

**1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?**

The Multilingual and Multicultural Education Program (MME) has five major goals in its programs which are listed in the SOAP as Goals A-E. This new program recently began in Spring 2014 and the courses that have been taught (LEE 281, LEE 282, LEE 283 and LEE 284.

The objectives of five major goals were assessed for this report:

- a. Provided students opportunities to investigate research topics and methods used in second language acquisition and literacy research.  
**Outcome:** Students were able to critically evaluate a selective piece of research in the area of second language acquisition.
- b. Provided students an in-depth review of research using various research methods specifically in studies in the field of second language acquisition.  
**Outcome:** Students were able to use the methods acquired in order to formulate their own research methods in order to develop their research topic.
- c. Encouraged students to adopt sound educational and pedagogical principles and theories in to their own practice as teachers and educational researchers.  
**Outcome:** Students reflected on their own teaching practices as they learned and evaluate new second language methods and how they would adopt in their classroom.
- d. Developed a research topic, developed a statement of purpose, and developed research questions, data methods and analysis in order to begin their project.  
**Outcome:** Final paper involved a presentation of research topic, questions, data methods in order to begin their project.
- e. Students explained the curriculum development for linguistically and culturally diverse students in the classrooms.  
**Outcome:** Students participated in discussion forms where they demonstrated critical thinking and decision making on curriculum applicable to linguistically and culturally diverse students.
- f. Students applied field theories of teaching and learning, as well as cultural traditions that impact a multilingual & multicultural classroom.  
**Outcome:** Students presented case studies that reflected field theories on of teaching and learning and their implications of multilingual & multicultural education.
- g. Students applied theories of first and second language acquisition in the multilingual & multicultural classroom.  
**Outcome:** Student reflected in collaborative group setting on reading assignments, classroom lectures, and class discussions that utilized appropriate data that measures progress of English Learners.
- h. Students identified multiple teaching methods for addressing the needs of speakers of other languages in schools, community, or business settings.

**Outcome:** Students submitted a final research paper that focus on the role of parental involvement or external business partnerships within linguistically and culturally diverse communities and demonstrated culturally responsive practices in teaching LCD learners

**Outcome:** Explication of knowledge of historical trends providing a critical analysis on the theoretical foundations that reflect the diverse populations that educators work with in K-16 school settings.

**Outcome:** Analysis, comparison of effective and productive leadership models that incorporate moral, ethical, socio-cultural and social justice perspectives.

**Outcome:** Reflections that illustrate a diverse learner’s viewpoint on present-day educational issue. Analysis and explication of global competencies within the context of educational leadership.

**Outcome:** Formulation and definition of guiding principles of leadership (i.e. innovation, authority, management, and vision).

This learning outcome assessment was completed as part of the course requirements for MME program. The writing competency was also assessed using a 4 point scoring rubric. To demonstrate competency, the student must score a 3 in each of three areas: Style and Format; Mechanics; and Content and Organization. Graduate faculty evaluated the writing sample. The MME students must demonstrate writing competence before advancement to candidacy. In order to demonstrate writing proficiency, MME students must receive a score of “3” in each area.

## **2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

Therefore, the term LCD was used to describe English learners as well as all other students who have a native language other than English and come from a variety of cultural backgrounds, ensuring that their linguistic and cultural diversity is valued.

The specific instruments that the program used to assess MME candidates are to:

- A.** Develop expertise and practical skills in designing, planning, implementing critical pedagogy in multilingual and cross-cultural programs through courses in first and second language acquisition theory, and responsive methodologies in bilingual, dual language, and English language development (ELD).
- B.** Provide educators with an advanced level of inquiry, research, and professional preparation with regards to cultural and linguistic learners.
- C.** Prepare instructional leaders who are cognizant of the challenging issues and rights faced by linguistically and culturally diverse learners in Pk-16 educational settings considering the moral, ethical and social justice perspectives.
- D.** Prepare scholars, teachers, resource specialists, and administrators in academic institutions, public schools, and federal and state agencies for careers in culturally and linguistically diverse settings.
- E.** Gain an understanding of the role of leadership within the context of global education systems as viewed and experienced by linguistically and culturally diverse communities.

The matrix, on the following page, demonstrates how each of the above stated program goals are aligned with the student learning outcomes as measured in each of the specific program core courses for the option in Multilingual Multicultural Education. For more details of each of the learning outcomes course syllabi can be referenced. The graduate students completing this course of study will have the option to enroll in a final project assignment (LEE 298) or a comprehensive exam plus 3 units of an approved elective.

### Program Student Outcomes as Measured by Course Matrix

| <b>Program Outcomes<br/>Students will:</b>  | <b>LEE 281</b><br>Critical<br>Pedagogy for<br>Diverse<br>Learners | <b>LEE 282</b><br>Research<br>Topics<br>in Sec. Lang.<br>Acquisition | <b>LEE 283</b><br>Cultural<br>Competency<br>for Educators | <b>LEE 284</b><br>Collaborative<br>Leadership for<br>Educational<br>Diversity | <b>LEE 298</b><br>Project or<br>Comprehensive<br>Exam |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| A-1- explain critical pedagogy in 1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> language through discussions and core assignments.   | <b>P</b>  | <b>S</b>   | <b>S</b>  |   | <b>S</b>  |
| A-2- demonstrate culturally responsive practices in teaching linguistically & culturally diverse learners through discussion and submission of case studies.  | <b>P</b>  | <b>S</b>   | <b>S</b>  |   | <b>S</b>  |
| A-3- demonstrate their ability to plan and design curriculum in content areas for linguistically & culturally diverse learners in a bilingual setting through the submission of case studies and research papers. |   | <b>S</b>   | <b>P</b>  |   | <b>S</b>  |
| B-1- interpret qualitative/ quantitative research related to second language acquisition through research assignments and class presentations.  | <b>S</b>  | <b>P</b>   |   |   | <b>P</b>  |
| B-2- demonstrate gradual level inquiry through research assignments and completion of graduate writing competency.  | <b>S</b>  | <b>P</b>   |   | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  |
| C-1- describe current issues in Pk-16 settings serving linguistically and culturally  | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>   | <b>S</b>  | <b>P</b>  | <b>S</b>  |

|   |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| diverse learners through discussions and meta notes.  |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| C-2- discuss, analyze, compare, and contrast linguistically and culturally diverse learners' rights in Pk-16 settings through collaborate group participation.  | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> |
| C-3- articulate multiple perspectives (i.e. morale, ethical, socio-cultural and social justice) that reflect effective leadership through collaborative group discussions and presentations.                          | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> |
| D-1- identify potential career advancement opportunities in diverse educational settings through class discussions, networking, and presentations.  | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>P</b> |
| D-2 - select a specific topic concerning bilingualism or multicultural education focusing on the role of parental involvement or external business partnerships within linguistically/culturally diverse communities. | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> |
| E-1- analyze and explain the importance of being globally competent within the context of educational leadership through assigned classroom debates and research.   | <b>S</b> |          |          | <b>P</b> |          | <b>P</b> |
| E-2- demonstrate their knowledge of leadership (i.e. innovation, authority, management, and vision) in relationship to diverse communities through their  | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>P</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>S</b> |

final research paper.

**Note:** (P) reflects the primary course responsible for assessment of student outcome.  
 (S) reflects the secondary course responsible for providing support of student outcome.

These instruments are requirements for LEE 281, LEE 283 course in order to assess student outcomes:

- Assessment 1: Reflection Papers evaluated Objective A-1.
- Assessment 2: Case Study evaluated Objective A-2.
- Assessment 3: Action Research Activity evaluated both Objective A -1 and A2.

Reviews of the Literature: MME graduates demonstrated their ability to research by completing a review of the literature (SOAP Goal) . A criterion rubric was used to evaluate the quality of the work completed by the student. Rubric summations was compiled and shared with the faculty. A rubric used to score the project or comprehensive exam. In addition, random projects was selected and reviewed every academic year by the entire faculty. The data was summarized and used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

### Learning Outcomes Rubric

|   | 1 Insufficient   | 2 Emerging   | 3 Developed  | 4 Highly Developed  |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Alignment of SOAP, outcomes, measures, and rubrics (if a rubric was used) | Outcomes are unclear or cannot be measured. The outcomes, measures (assignments) and rubrics (if used) are not aligned.  | At least some of the outcomes are clearly stated and can be measured. The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are related to some extent but do not correspond to the degree that they need to do so.  | The outcomes are all clearly stated and can be measured using indirect and direct evidence. The outcomes, measures, and rubric are aligned to a considerable extent.   | All outcomes are clear and detailed and can be measured in multiple ways. The outcomes, measures, and rubric all focus on exactly the same skills or aspects of learning and are thus aligned and all are stated using terms that are clear                     |
| Evidence and Discovery from Data  | The measure/assignment does not have clear directions and/or does not provide enough information to evaluate if a learning outcome was met. A very small and insufficiently diverse sample of student work was used. The results are not clearly | The assignment is clearly stated and provides information related to a learning outcome that can be evaluated. The sample includes a minimum of ten examples of student work and the sample is random/diverse. The results are described but not in enough | The assignment is clearly stated and provides considerable information that can be used to evaluate whether or not a learning outcome was met. The sample includes at least fifteen examples of student work and is sufficiently random/diverse. The | The assignment has clear and detailed instructions and the student work provides considerable amount of information directly related to a learning outcome. At least twenty samples of student work are reviewed and the sample is random and very diverse. The |

|                                     |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                                     | described or are just listed in a simplistic way.  | detail.  | results are described in detail and specific examples are given.   | results are described in detail with both patterns and anomalies in the results clearly indicated.   |
| Consideration of and use of results | Assessment review is not in-depth and no review of the results is conducted after they are included in an initial report. The results are not reviewed or discussed by more than one or two faculty members. No real conclusions are drawn and no attempt is made to consider the program in light of the assessment data. | Assessment review is in some depth and the results are discussed by multiple faculty. Some conclusions are drawn based on the report and these conclusions are discussed in relation to the program. | Assessment review is enough depth and the evaluation of student work is conducted by and discussed by multiple faculty several times. Conclusions are drawn based on the results and these conclusions are used to either confirm that students are meeting the learning outcomes or to discuss potential changes. | Assessment is conducted in depth and results from multiple years are discussed by the faculty. Conclusions are drawn and are used to identify and strengths and weaknesses of the program and to consider whether or not changes to the program should be made.      |
| Overall Engagement in Assessment    | Very little assessment activity is reported. Outcomes, measures, and rubrics are not aligned and/or assessment data is not evaluated or used to decide if changes should be made to program.   | Some assessment activity is reported but there are issues with alignment. It is not clear that assessment results are considered or used to evaluate program and decide if changes should be made.   | Continuous assessment activity carried out. The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are aligned and the assessment data is utilized to evaluate the program in terms of strengths, weaknesses, and whether or not any changes should be made.  | Continuous and well-planned assessment is carried out The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are very closely aligned and the results are frequently reviewed and used to evaluate the program in terms of strengths, weaknesses, and potential changes to the program. |

### 3. What did you discover from these results?

In reference to the instruments used to assess MME goals and objectives, the following findings are listed.

**Assessment 1** – Reflection papers were evaluated with 4 criteria: descriptive, personal, critical, and creative. The reflection was also to include a visual element, a quotation and a response to the quotation. Reflection Papers indicated relative strengths for all students in their ability to

explain critical pedagogy. Six students (n=6) scored 5 points out a possible of 5 points for every one of the reflections they attempted with one student missing two attempts. The range was 5.0 to 5.0 and the mean was 5.0 for all attempts. The reflections were all very good and formed the basis for discussion in our seminar.

**Assessment 2** -Action Research Activities were strength in all students in their ability to demonstrate culturally responsive practices in teaching LCD learners. The mean score was 46.3 out of 50 points for all 6 students with a range of 44-48.

**Assessment 3**- Case Study Project indicated relative strength from all students in their ability to utilized essential skills in designing, planning, and implementing critical pedagogy in multilingual and cross-cultural settings. For all the 6 students (n=6) the mean score was 47.1 and the range was from 45-50.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?**

Changes in assessment instruments, such as rubrics, and in the curriculum have been made to further capture **strengthen or weakness** in students' performances relative to each of the Outcomes in Goal A- E for 2015-16. Since the reflection papers turned out to be so good and revealing, we increased the number of reflection papers from 5 per semester for LEE 283 to 10 per semester. We will also develop a rubric that reflects the criteria. As we teach more courses and more students, we will examine the trends to determine more modifications to the program.

- a. A criterion rubric was used to evaluate the quality of the work completed by the students.
- b. Rubric summations was compiled and shared with the faculty.
- c. Data collected (assignments) was summarized and used to make a comparative analysis of program delivery across courses.
- d. A rubric was used to score the project or comprehensive exam.
- e. In addition, random projects and comprehensive exams was selected and reviewed every academic year by the entire faculty.
- f. The data was summarized and used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.
- g. Candidates in this program was encouraged to access student data from their school settings to evaluate the program impact on student learning outcomes for the purpose of program improvement.
- h. This was useful tracking data to analyze over time for addressing achievement gaps that continue to exist in K-16 settings.

#### **5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-16 academic year?**

This program started in the Spring of 2014 and is in the infancy stages of development. The expectation is to establish a strong foundation in order to assess and measure student activities and outcomes.

The MME candidates will participate in a discussion forum and debate on major contemporary issues concerning LCD students. The MM candidates will acquire meta-note skills; produce two case studies, two final presentation/research papers. In addition, MME graduate students will

produce either a scholarship piece of work (typically 4-5 characters in length and conforming to the University requirements for a thesis in writing style and format) or take a comprehensive exam.

These assessments are designed to assist the candidates in demonstrating their cross-cultural knowledge and leadership skills in reference to LCD settings and to advance their level of inquiry, research, and professional preparation. A criterion rubric will be used to evaluate the quality of the work completed by the students. Rubric summations will be compiled and shared with the faculty.

Data collected (assignments) will be summarized and used to make a comparative analysis of program delivery across courses. A rubric will be used to score the project or comprehensive exam. In addition, random projects and comprehensive exams will be selected and reviewed every academic year by the entire faculty. The data will be summarized and used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

Candidates in this program will be encouraged to access student data from their school settings to evaluate the program impact on student learning outcomes for the purpose of program improvement. This will be useful tracking data to analyze over time for addressing achievement gaps that continue to exist in K-16 settings.

#### **6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

The first and second cohort of the MME graduated from the program in spring 2016. The students successfully completed their projects on their selected topics and continued on with their jobs, one student entered a doctoral program at UC San Diego and was also the Kremen Dean's medalist as well as the University, graduate dean's medalist.

We established and continue to update our program website and have advertised the program via the Liberal Studies and Credential listserves. We have contacted principals and district staff to establish cohorts. We continue to offer courses at times when teachers can attend (4-7 p.m., 7-10 p.m., during the summer, on weekends) and at locations convenient for many. We are planning to establish graduate cohort in Visalia (Visalia Unified School Districts and hopefully Chowchilla as well). We continually update the technology infused in our program.

## **Liberal Studies Program**

**Dr. Susan Schlievert, Coordinator**

### **LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

#### **1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

As approved by the Liberal Studies Advisory Committee (LSRC), Liberal Studies assesses four areas:

1. Content: Demonstrate proficiency in the 12 content areas as they are delineated in the State of California document Content Specifications for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (Subject Matter Standards)
2. Diversity- Describe, compare, or demonstrate the impact of diversity in a multi-culturally and linguistically responsive manner.
3. Pedagogy- Identify, describe, or demonstrate appropriate content specific teaching practices to facilitate learning.
4. Technology: Evaluate and use a variety of strategies and emerging electronic technologies for effective instructional communication.
5. While each outcome is discussed annually, the emphasis and formal assessment for 2015-2016 addressed Content.

ENGL 117W (Portfolios)

Objective: Content Specifications for Reading, Language & Literature and History Social Science

#### **Non-Written and Written Communication**

2.1.1 Identify and use the conventions associated with what is called standard English

2.1.2 Recognize, understand, and use a range of conventions in both spoken and written English, including varieties of sentence structure, preferred usage and conventional forms of spelling, capitalization and punctuation in written English

2.3.1 Demonstrate their knowledge of principles of composition, such as paragraphing, transitional phrases, appropriate vocabulary, and context

2.3.2 Compose and/or analyze writing according to conventions in different genres, including narrative, interpretive, descriptive, persuasive and expository writing, as well as summaries, letters, and research reports

2.3.4 Understand and are able to use bibliographic citations in a standard format

2.4.4 Demonstrate knowledge of dialects, idiolects, and changes in what is considered standard oral English usage and their effects on perceptions of speaker performance, with attention to the dangers of stereotyping and bias

3.1.1 Analyze narrative and expository texts, with special attention to children’s literature, from a range of cultures, for both literary elements and structural features

3.1.4 Identify and evaluate structural devices in prose and poetry (such as rhyme, metaphor, and alliteration), and they examine the connections among organizational structures, the writer’s view point, and the goals of reading

3.2.1 Analyze texts in different literary genres (novels, short stories, folk and fairy tales, and poetry of various types, for example), as they are represented in different cultures, according to their structure, organization, and purpose

3.3.1 Literal and figurative meanings in texts, from a range of cultures and genres, using textual support for inferences, conclusions, and generalizations they draw from any work

## **2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

### **Direct Measures**

A. Course Assignments (w/scoring rubrics)

B. California Subjects Examination for Teachers (Subtests 101, 102 and 103)

C. Portfolio of field experience/lesson plans/unit design

### Example 1: Controversial Issues in Children’s Literature

Choose a controversial issue and/or text within children’s literature that you would like to research and defend. Consider the scenario that you plan to teach this text or issue to your future students but there has been a complaint about your choice. The result of that complaint is that you must defend your chosen text to the school board and parents. Because you will want to be more than prepared to argue your case before a panel of concerned parents and administrators, you must be an expert on the matter. That expertise only comes from research and writing.

For this project, you need to 1) write a research proposal providing the topic of your research; 2) create an annotated bibliography of at least four different sources (both primary and secondary); and 3) write a researched argument defending your topic that includes both primary research (ie: examples from the texts you are writing about) and secondary research (ie: analysis or arguments that you can develop, that support your claim or that challenge your research). This project is meant to give you an opportunity for in depth study of a particular issue of interest to you within children’s literature.

### Example 2: Writing Project #2 – Fairy Tales Revisited

Prompt: For this project, you will write a fairy tale from another perspective or point of view. This project has two parts. First, rewrite a story of your choice by 1) choosing to tell the story from another character's point of view, 2) choosing to place the story in a (different) historical context, or 3) choosing to tell the story by emphasizing gender, race, or class dynamics.

For this writing project, it will be important to position your rewriting next to the dominant, agreed upon story (explicitly or implicitly) to show the ways that you are rewriting the story;

thus the story that you tell should be recognizable as the story you started with. In addition, you should consider these questions as you write:

- 1) What is the purpose of rewriting this story? What do you want to bring to light through this retelling?
- 2) What distinctions are you trying to make by rewriting this story?
- 3) What elements of the interpretation or telling of this story do you want to highlight / critique?

The second part of this assignment includes a reflection and analysis of your storytelling. In this section, you should consider these questions:

- 1) Why did you tell the story in the ways that you did?
- 2) What rhetorical choices did you make and why?
- 3) How did the choices you made reflect the kind of reading and discussion we have had in class about the different versions of fairy tales?

### Example 3: Writing From Children's Literature

Read over the following questions to provide you with a focus for reviewing your portfolio of writing. Examine your past work closely, then consider the following questions to help you generate information for your final reflection and analysis. Show me how well you have learned to write this semester, how writing has effected you. Use the following questions as brainstorming strategies only.

- Which writing project do you feel especially proud of? Explain why.
- Which writing project did you learn the most from? Describe what you learned.
- Describe some brainstorming strategies you've tried this semester. Which seemed to be the most helpful? Why?
- Describe revision strategies that you found helpful.
- Review your reflections on your writing projects. What do these responses reveal about your writing process and your development as a writer?
- In reviewing your portfolio, what surprises you about the writing you completed for this class? What surprises you about the processes you've used to do the writing?
- Review the self-assessment you completed at the beginning of the semester. Do you feel the same about your writing as you did 16 weeks ago? How have you changed?
- Did you feel a sense of personal growth as a result of the writing assignments? Was there any project that empowered you as an individual? Explain.

### Indirect Measures

- A. Liberal Studies Exit Survey
- B. CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs (Alumni Survey)
- C. Liberal Studies Program-designed Course Evaluations

### Learning Outcome(s) Measures

1. Content: California Subjects Examination for Teachers (CSET)

2. Diversity: Liberal Studies Exit Survey and Course Evaluations
  3. Pedagogy: Portfolio
  4. Technology: Course assignments with Scoring Rubrics and Alumni Surveys
- Standard for Student Performance: 80% of students will score an average of 80% or “passing”.

### **3. What did you discover from these data?**

1. Content: For English 117W (lower division writing sample requirement), all but one student met the criteria. This course is process driven. Because students work through each assignment together and portions of the assignments are due along the way, students tend to complete the assignments and complete the course. The students also participated in literature circles for a more in depth study of children's literature, resulting in oral presentations.
2. Diversity: Students responded favorably on the exit survey.
3. Pedagogy: Field experiences and observations were beneficial. Instructors had an additional task, because students needed Common Core State Standards (CCSS) preparation, as well. Preparation for faculty across campus was inconsistent.
4. Technology: Assignments were rigorous and provided usable models for students. Alumni Surveys were positive and at the desired level.

Provide a discussion of student performance in relation to your standards of performance. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

1. Content: For English 117W, all but one student met the criteria. CSET scores are difficult to assess because they are self-reported only and data is not available from the testing company. It is a desirable measure---and a requirement for entrance to the credential programs---but students choose to report (or not). While a smaller number of native students may pass the required CSET exams, all students who enter the credential programs have passed the exams. There are ongoing discussions and prescriptive measures to address this.
2. Diversity: Our student population is diverse. Faculty teaching Liberal Studies courses represent many departments, ethnicities, genders, and points of view. This is an asset to the program and allows the students to experience other schools/colleges and instructors.
3. Pedagogy: Liberal Studies students need content knowledge and pedagogy. One instructor's view of “Best Practices” may not coincide with another's viewpoint. There are many ways to teach the same content; our students experience and learn from different approaches.

### **4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?**

1. Content: The faculty groups discussed the findings. Face-to-face CSET preparation classes were promoted as well as on-line practice. Through proactive advising, students are aware of the CSET exams at their first meeting with an advisor. Tests are then monitored for completion. (Note: The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is in the process of discussing/re-instating the Waiver to the CSET tests.)
2. Diversity: Faculty groups discussed ways to assist English Language Learners and the resources available to those students.
3. Pedagogy: Through a grant, some teachers across campus were exposed to Common Core and different strategies for teaching.

4. Technology: Instructors evaluated their syllabi and made appropriate changes. Many modeled strategies using technology including tablets and “smart” phones. In addition, two other classrooms were updated and joined Ed. 157 to better serve the students.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-17 academic year?**

1. Content: Demonstrate proficiency in the 12 content areas as they are delineated in the State of California document Content Specifications for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (Subject Matter Standards)
2. Diversity- Describe, compare, or demonstrate the impact of diversity in a multi-culturally and linguistically responsive manner.
3. Pedagogy- Identify, describe, or demonstrate appropriate content specific teaching practices to facilitate learning.
4. Technology: Evaluate and use a variety of strategies and emerging electronic technologies for effective instructional communication.

While each outcome is discussed annually, the emphasis and formal assessment for 2016-2017 will be determined by analysis of survey assessment questionnaires in SSCI 180, SOC 11, and LING32. We will continue to examine and monitor results from the California Subjects Examination for Teachers (CSET) to determine the level of content preparation for teachers.

**6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**

The mission of the Liberal Studies Blended Program is to provide a strong knowledge-based education in the liberal arts, along with skills and attributes that will provide subject matter preparation for elementary teaching or preparation for other professions.

Because the Liberal Studies Program encompasses many disciplines, the LSRC regularly discussed courses from different departments, schools, and colleges. They examined state laws, requirements and federal programs. As a result, we adjusted the Liberal Studies offerings (including CSET Review) to reflect current practices and mandates.

**Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership  
Dr. Ken Magdaleno, Director**

**LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

---

**1. What learning outcome(s) did you access this year?**

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPELFS) has six program outcomes, which are as follows:

1. Lead successful educational change and reform for teaching and learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century through ethical, equitable and research-based best practices.
2. Employ critical and systems thinking to identify root causes of complex educational problems and develop meaningful solutions to address educational inequities.
3. Respect and engage diverse families, organizations and communities through collaborative partnerships and networking.
4. Collaborate with others to generate and apply a professional knowledge base that integrates both experiential and research knowledge to inform leadership decisions; undertake appropriate critical inquiry and research studies to inform leadership decisions.
5. Construct and use program evaluations and assessments for the purpose of improving program quality.
6. Formulate administrative and instructional effective approaches and best practices to improve the quality of instruction and the learning environment for all students.

SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort.

SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice.

SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader.

SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success.

SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations.

**2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

The DPELFS uses multiple direct and indirect measures to gauge student and program outcomes. These instruments include:

*Direct Measures*

1. Embedded Fieldwork Assessment (Client Evaluation Semi-Structured Interview)

2. Qualifying Examination and Rubrics (Problems of Practice)
3. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Preliminary Defense)(Oral and Written Rubrics)
4. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Final Defense) (Oral and Written Rubrics)

*Indirect Measures*

1. Annual Student Evaluation (Based on assessments and comments from the core faculty and Red, Yellow, and Green Disposition Survey)
2. Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey)
3. Town Hall Meetings
4. Alumni Survey
5. Employer Survey
6. External Review of Dissertations (Rubric) - as part of the WASC process

SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation**

SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation and Qualifying Examination**

SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader. **Pre and Post 360 Disposition Surveys**

SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success. **Dissertation Criteria and Oral Written Rubric**

SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation**

### **3. What did you discover from the data?**

- There is a need to re-establish the Graduate group fieldwork subcommittee.
- Client fieldwork surveys needed to be redeveloped to be more closely aligned with student learning outcomes and program outcomes and include a semi-structured interview component.
- A majority of all of the DEPLFS students who sat for the qualifying exam passed within the first attempt. Although some students were required to retake a portion of the exam, all students successfully passed the exam with the exception of one student who was dismissed from the program for academic dishonesty.
- Students consistently score between 4.0-5.0 on the dissertation written and oral defense. The 5-point rubric provides criteria in relation to the quality of six parts of the dissertation: Introduction; Review of Literature; Methods; Results and Outcome; Discussion and Writing Quality.
- There is a need to revamp and transform the Student and Employer Administrator Disposition 360 Surveys to an online format in order to improve response rates and progress

monitoring of the surveys. The 360 survey is a self-assessment (perception) tool of a candidate's educational leadership dispositions, which is administered to each student pre and post program. Responses are also solicited from their work colleagues (360 – supervisor, peer, subordinate).

- We found there is a need to track past alumni and maintain up to date records for surveying purposes.

SLO: 1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation Standard Met-** Yes, All the students involved in embedded fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results. Fieldwork clients were assessed at the end of each fieldwork project, program facilitators use qualitative data to measure impact on organization, professionalism and overall quality of the work product.

SLO: 2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, inquiry processes, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation and Qualifying Examination Standard Met-** Yes, students use organization theory analysis as learned in core courses to apply in the evaluation of client organization. All students who participated in fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results. All students currently in year 3 passed the qualifying examination and were approved to begin the dissertation process.

SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader. **Pre and Post 360 Disposition Surveys Standard Met-** Yes, however, there was a low response rate on these surveys since they were distributed in paper/pencil format. According to the survey results, we had approximately 20% return rate from previous cohorts. The ratings demonstrated positive self-perception in leadership disposition skills (pre/post) but there was not enough data at this time. This survey has since been modified to an electronic format to provide for much faster responses and a more efficient process of collecting surveys from students, employers and peers.

SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success. **Dissertation Criteria and Oral Written Rubric Standard Met-** Yes, all students who defended their dissertations received an average of 4's and 5's on the dissertation rubrics and passed their preliminary and final defense. All students are expected to complete a comprehensive review of the literature, include various theoretical frameworks, thought provoking conclusions among other things. This is all assessed using a rubric during the preliminary and final oral defense of the dissertation. Approximately 3-5 students from both Fresno/Bakersfield cohorts are still working on completing their final defense.

SLO: 5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations. **Embedded Fieldwork Evaluation Standard Met-** Yes, All the students involved in embedded fieldwork met the criteria for the fieldwork as measured by passing their course and positive embedded fieldwork evaluation results.

#### **4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?**

- DPELFS faculty developed a new Embedded Fieldwork Client Evaluation and online logging system. The embedded fieldwork client evaluation includes a semi-structured interview component to better gather information from the clients.
- DPELFS Embedded Fieldwork Subcommittee is established to help ensure quality fieldwork outcomes, progress monitoring of fieldwork, and ongoing fieldwork improvement.
- The DPELFS Graduate Faculty Group adopted a new policy for administering the Qualitative Exam. Core Faculty voted on creating a two-page study guide aligned with the core courses to help assist students during Qualifying Examinations (new policy is in place beginning with CODEL Cohort 1 and DPELFS Cohort 10 students).
- Town Hall meetings are scheduled to occur in the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 (one face to face and one electronic survey version of the town hall questions developed to gather additional input from students who cannot make the town hall meetings).
- The DPELFS office has been contacting past Alumni to update records and requesting students to contact the doctoral office when they change email addresses, phone numbers and or place of employment.

#### **5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in 2016-17 academic year?**

The DPELFS measure all of the program and student outcomes on a continual basis. The 2016-2017 academic year will include many of the same assessment activities as the previous year, but will be shaped by the Graduate Group and staff's redesign of the SOAP (new format) to rigorously and concisely measure progress toward the outcomes. The technical qualities of the instruments used will also be evaluated where applicable.

The DPELFS uses multiple direct and indirect measures to gauge student and program outcomes. These instruments include:

##### *Direct Measures*

1. Embedded Fieldwork Assessment (Client Evaluation Semi-structured Interview)
2. Qualifying Examination and Rubrics (Problems of Practice)
3. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Preliminary Defense)(Oral and Written Rubrics)
4. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Final Defense) (Oral and Written Rubrics)

##### *Indirect Measures*

1. Annual Student Evaluation (based on assessments and comments from the core faculty (Red, Yellow, and Green Disposition Survey)
2. Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey)
3. Town Hall Meetings
4. Alumni Survey
5. Employer Survey
6. External Review of Dissertations (Rubric)

## **6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review?**

We will continue to execute the Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process the data is changed into information in order to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports in sustaining a program of high quality, which was acknowledged and recognized by the external reviewer. Some progress points are also indicated below:

- Strengthening Graduate Group Culture (regular meetings established)
- Re-established Graduate Group Subcommittees
- Electronic format of the 360 student and employer surveys developed
- Electronic format of the town hall surveys utilized in addition to face to face meeting to collect valuable information about the program
- Embedded fieldwork evaluation and progress monitoring process refined
- Writing studio collaboration to support students through the process of writing their dissertation