FRESNO STATE

Discovery. Diversity. Distinction.

Kremen School of Education and Human Development

Program Assessment Reports
2014-2015

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

Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)

Dr. Walter J. Ullrich, Coordinator

<div align="center">

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

</div>

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 2014/15 for both Cohort 9 (who began the program fall 2013 and graduated fall 2014) and Cohort 10 (who began the program fall 2014 and will graduate this fall 2015) 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 2015-16 academic year?

Before beginning the 2014/2015 Annual Report, a few caveats are in order: First, new MAT faculty -- Dr. Nancy Akhavan (ERE 243, CI 245) -- began her prominent role as lead faculty in the program's research strand last fall 2014. 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 spring, 2015 for his work with MAT Cohort 9. Because of these successes, Dr. Akhavan will offer ERE 243 to the new Cohort 11 and Dr. Ullrich will offer CI 260 to the graduating Cohort 10 in the DISCOVERYe Tablet Program fall 2015. Second, MAT Cohort 9 graduate Veronica Miralles-Hernandez received the KSOEHD's Outstanding Project Award and Christopher Hatch and Richard Ribaudo 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 9 passed their Comprehensive Examination fall 2014, consistent with reaching the Mastery level on all 7 learning outcomes identified below.

*(1) Critical Questioner (CQ): CI240 (Fall, 2014), <u>ENTRY LEVEL</u>; CI241, (Spring, 2015), <u>INTERMEDIATE LEVEL</u>; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), 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 <u>addressed</u> and <u>assessed</u> in the following ways:

1. CI 240 was refined summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) by a new faculty Dr. Melanie Wenrick to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was refined by Dr. Wenrick before spring 2015 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246 and CI 260 were refined summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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. <u>Data/Results</u> 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 2015 to <u>refine</u> CI260 and CI246 to continue to help students reach the <u>Mastery</u> 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 four years, the NCATE visit spring 2014, and more specifically the data collected above, Dr. Melanie Wenrick (faculty responsible for the foundations/curriculum/instruction strand in the MAT) refined CI240 summer 2015 for her fall 2015 offering. Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI 260 and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2015 for their fall 2015 offerings.

*(2) Scholar Activist (SA): ERE 243 (Fall, 2014), <u>ENTRY</u>; CI 245 (Spring, 2015), <u>INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014),</u> CI 260 (Fall, 2014) CI 298B Fall, 2014) 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 <u>addressed and assessed</u> in the following ways:

1. ERE 243 was refined summer 2014 and assessed fall 2014 by a new faculty Dr. Nancy Akhavan to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 was re-designed before spring 2015 by Dr. Akhavan to continue to assist students in reaching this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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 <u>Data/Results</u> 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, 50% of the MAT Cohort 10 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience, as fine a testament to Dr. Akhavan's expertise as any.

4 These data were used summer 2015 to <u>refine</u> ERE 243 and CI 245 for the Entry and Intermediate levels respectively and CI260, CI246, and CI298B to assist students reach the <u>Mastery</u> level for their final semester coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience fall 2015.

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 (new faculty responsible for the research strand in the MAT) built on these data to refine ERE 243 and CI 245

for fall 2015.

Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI 260 and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2015 for their fall 2015 offerings.

*(3) Mixed Methods Action Researcher/Qualitative and Quantitative (MMAR): ERA243 (Fall), ENTRY; CI245 (Spring), INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), CI 298B (Fall, 2014) 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) to help students continue to reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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, 50% of the MAT Cohort 10 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience.
4. These data were used summer 2014 and again summer 2015 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 four years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, Dr. Nancy Akhavan refined ERE 243 summer 2015 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 will redesign CI246, CI260, and CI298B to build on these data and reflect the new SOAP once these courses conclude fall 2015.

*(4) Critically Reflective, Equity-Oriented Practitioner (CREQP): CI240 (Fall), ENTRY; CI241, (Spring), INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), CI 298B (Fall, 2014) 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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, Dr. Melanie Wenrick will continue to refine CI240 and CI241 with respect to the data in this Annual Report and reflect the new SOAP (spring 2014) while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich will refine CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris

Foster will refine CI 246 to build on these data and reflect the new SOAP once these courses conclude fall 2015.

*(5) Clear Communicator (CC): CI 240 (Fall), ERE 243 (Fall) <u>ENTRY</u>; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), <u>INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), CI 298B (Fall, 2014) MASTERY</u>

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 <u>addressed and assessed</u> in the following ways:

1. CI240 and ERE 243 was redesigned summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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. <u>Data/Results</u> 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the <u>Mastery</u> 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, Dr. Nancy Akhavan and Dr. Melanie Wenrick continue to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report and

reflect the new SOAP (spring 2014) while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich will refine CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster to build on these data and reflect the new SOAP once these courses conclude fall 2015.

*(6) Technological Navigator (TN): CI240 (Fall), ERA243 (Fall), <u>ENTRY</u>; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), <u>INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), CI 298B (Fall,</u> 2014) 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 <u>addressed and assessed</u> in the following ways:

1. CI 240 and ERE 243 were refined summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI 241 and CI 245 were refined before spring 2015 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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. <u>Data/Results</u> 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, <u>not</u> as a teacher of students.

4. These data were used summer 2014 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the <u>Mastery</u> level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience as teachers using technology with students, <u>not primarily</u> 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, Dr. Nancy Akhavan and Dr. Melanie Wenrick will continue to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report and reflect the new SOAP (spring 2014) while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich will redesign CI246, CI260, and CI298B to build on these data and reflect the new SOAP once these courses conclude fall 2015.

*(7) Social Justice Collaborator (SJC): CI240 (Fall), <u>ENTRY</u>; CI241, (Spring), <u>INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2014), CI 260 (Fall, 2014), CI 298B (Fall, 2014) MASTERY</u>

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 was 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 <u>addressed and assessed</u> in the following ways:

1. CI240 was redesigned summer 2014 (and summer 2015 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 2014 (and again summer 2015) 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. <u>Data/Results</u> 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 2014 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the <u>Mastery</u> 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, Dr. Melanie Wenrick continues to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report and reflect the new SOAP (spring 2014) while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich and Dr. Chris Foster redesign CI246, CI260, and CI298B to build on these data and reflect the new SOAP once these courses conclude fall 2015.

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).

Curriculum and Instruction (MAE-C&I)

Dr. Carol Fry Bohlin, Coordinator (August 2006-January 2012; Sept. 2014-Present)

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 3.1: Graduates will evaluate various forms of research and/or evaluation used to document students' learning, teaching effectiveness, curricula, and programs.
- Objective 4.1: Graduates will communicate research-based arguments for educational issues, policies, or research design.

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 these objectives, and one key assignment that is used to determine the level of a student's attainment of these objectives is the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR). During one of the Fall 2014 sections of CI 250, the writing skills of a number of students were noted to be relatively weak, which prompted a multi-section (CI 250) analysis of student writing competency to see if any trends were apparent. Three instructors of CI 250 (two in Fall 2014 and one in Spring 2015) provided data on student performance according to the rubric. Instructor A taught a section for students in a cohort earning two teaching credentials plus the MAE-C&I degree in 1.5 years. Instructor B taught students in an on-campus section populated by non-cohorted MAE-C&I students, where an estimated 80% are currently K-12 teachers. Instructor C taught students in an off-campus cohort of primarily experienced elementary school teachers. All used the same grading rubric, where a score of 3 ("Good") or 4 ("Excellent") was required in each category in order to pass the GWR.

b. Comprehensive Exams: In addition to analyzing student performance on the Graduate Writing Requirement 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 were required of all students in the Teacher Residency Program, a grant-funded program that supports students in earning two teaching credentials and the MAE-C&I degree. No other students took CEs last AY.

c. Exit Surveys: Data from two instruments assessing student perceptions of program quality were reviewed. Data from student exit surveys (KSOEHD and Division of Graduate Studies--DGS) were last analyzed over three years ago, so it was determined that a review of the past four semesters of exit surveys would be important to conduct.

• KSOEHD Survey: Program Coordinators are responsible for providing the survey link to their advanced credential and master's students. The survey was developed to assess 20 diverse programs, and of the 15 Likert-type items on the survey, about 1/3 are relevant to the MAE-C&I program. The open-ended items (major strengths of program; suggestions for potential change) have yielded the most important data in the past. The MAE-C&I "Project and Thesis Guidelines" document includes instructions to fill out the survey, and the Program Coordinator is to remind graduates to do so.

• DGS Survey: The Division of Graduate Studies reported that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) took over the collection and analysis of the DGS Survey four years ago, so OIE was asked to pull up any Exit Survey data for MAE-C&I that the office had collected. On the DGS graduation form, students see the following instructions: "IMPORTANT NOTE: Please take the Graduating Students Survey by clicking on the following link – https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_e3ZwmKqz3y6Oc9D…" The initial link is broken, but the latter URL leads the student to a survey that has students rate their classes (relevant, current, available, challenging), program faculty (knowledgeable about degree requirements and deadlines, helpful, committed, timely in feedback, and available), and 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:

Instructor	Passed GWR on 1st attempt	Passed GWR on 2nd attempt	Passed GWR on 3rd attempt	Haven't passed	Total # of students
A	6 (25%)	11 (45.8%)	2 (8.3%)	5 (20.8%)	24
B	6 (26%)	14 (60.8%)	3 (13%)	0	23
C	18 (100%)	0	0	0	18

Instructor A reported that of those who haven't yet passed the assignment, one had health problems, two attempted it once and have not yet turned in any revisions, and two attempted it twice and still need to make revisions to bring the papers up to APA standards. These students are delaying completion of their master's degrees.

Instructor B reported that most of the students who passed the GWR on their 2nd attempt had relatively few errors on their initial papers. Those who passed on their 3rd-4th attempts were either international students or creative writing instructors.

Instructor C reported that all students passed the GWR on their first attempt.

(b) Comprehensive Exams:

The following chart provides the scores of the 19 students who took the Comprehensive Exam this summer. (This data technically should be in the 2015-16 report, but we had it available so have included it here.) The responses to each item were rated 1-Fail, 2-Pass, or 3-Exemplary by the instructor of the course and writer of the prompt. 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 Issues (1.2)	CI 250 Curriculum (1.1)	CI 275 Instruction (2.1)	CI 275 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

Exit Surveys:

- KSOEHD Exit Survey:

We learned that relatively few surveys were completed: 2 for Spring 2014, 2 for Fall 2014, and 3 for Spring 2015. Answers to questions such as the following were usually "Excellent Preparation," particularly for the most recent graduates:
- I am prepared to respond with fairness to disabled, ethnically and linguistically diverse students.
- My preparation has upheld the concept that all individuals can learn.
- I have proper theoretical grounding in my field.

- I am familiar with the research in my field.
- I can think critically about theory and research in my field and put it into practice.

In addition, the statements written in the open-ended section by the Spring 2015 graduates were quite complimentary:
- The major strength of the program is the professors. There are great professors who truly care about the success and content information obtained by the students in all C&I classes. The professors are really helpful and have a lot of knowledge to help expose students to different theories, learning styles, curriculum, and a variety of experiences.
- Accepting of everyone! I felt welcome and comfortable in every course I took. The professors are not only professional, but provide genuineness. Each course taught me the information needed for the topic. I feel as though I am prepared to move on and feel confident professionally and personally.
- The most important thing for me was the general welcoming atmosphere of this department. Coming from the history department was like night and day. I felt very comfortable and was able to learn new concepts and theories without feeling like an idiot. Thank you!

- OIE Exit Survey (Graduating Students Survey)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness searched for over a week for any exit survey data for MAE-C&I graduate degree applicants from the past four years and concluded that none existed. OIE noted that not a lot of graduate students from any program take the survey.

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

Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR) Assignment:

The success rate for students in the CI 250 sections of Teachers B and C indicates that they were well-prepared for success on the GWR assignment. Students in Teacher C's class were particularly successful, possibly because the assignment came at the end of the course and because most of the students were active teacher of English grammar and composition. The students in Teacher B's class were also successful, although International students still struggle with academic writing. We will encourage all students with writing challenges to utilize the services of the Graduate Writing Studio (www.fresnostate.edu/academics/gradstudies/thesis/graduatewritingstudio.html).

Students in the intensive Teacher Residency Program (TRP) 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 play a role in course assignment success, including the GWR, as the data above indicate. The instructor of CI 250 for the TRP is also in charge of course scheduling for the cohort, so she is planning ways to adjust the timing of the course and assignment to help maximize student writing success.

Exit Surveys:

- KSOEHD Exit Survey:

The results of the KSOEHD Exit Survey indicate that students viewed the faculty who teach courses in the MAE-C&I program as caring, professional, and helpful. Students feel that they are well-equipped with educational theory, and can use this knowledge to conduct relevant research and apply it to their practice. There was one comment that indicated that the level of rigor and focus on current/emerging educational topics was not what was expected. We will share the findings with the graduate faculty and urge continued focus on providing a challenging experience with cutting edge topics.

- OIE Graduating Students Survey

We were quite surprised and 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 links for the KSOEHD Exit Survey (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ksoehd-exitsurvey) and the OIE Graduating Students Survey (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 revision.

As an addendum, we noted that student success (progress to completion) among students in the Sanger master's cohort (experienced teachers) was excellent (100% retention). This has spurred us to advertise in September for yet another district-wide cohort, this time in the northern part of our service region (Chowchilla). We will be reporting next year on the success of our promotions and, if successful in establishing a cohort there, on the progress of the students after one semester (Spring 2016).

On the other hand, we also noted during the year 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. We will be evaluating student success in elective course completion next year.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-16 academic year?
Briefly list the outcomes to be assessed and how you will measure them. This should align with the activities provided in your SOAP.

In our SOAP, the 2015-16 AY "assessment methods and summary evaluations" include (a) the Graduate Writing Requirement Analysis (Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2) and (b) the Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment Analysis (Outcomes 2.1, 2.2. and 3.2). We also plan to

conduct an Alumni Survey and continue reviewing the data from the Exit Surveys. (We hope to have more of the latter next year.) As noted above, we will advertise for a new MAE-C&I cohort in Chowchilla in September (to begin in Spring 2016).

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

We established and continue to update our program website and have advertised the program via the Liberal Studies and Credential listservs. 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 have established successful graduate cohorts (Sanger and Fresno Unified School Districts last year and hopefully Chowchilla this year). We continually update the technology infused in our program and offer courses in labs with cutting edge technology. We passed state and national accreditation with glowing reviews last year (no areas for improvement).

Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Linda Hauser, Coordinator

<div align="center">

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

</div>

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 finalizing a proposal for HEAL to be a specific option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State through the Department of Educational Leadership. For the 2015-16 academic year, our two pathways have a combined 183 students (152 P-12 and 31 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 adoption of new standards by the CTC and proposal work for HEAL as a specific degree option, the Educational Leadership and Administration program is undergoing transition, therefore, as approved by Dr. Nef through communications with Associate Interim Dean, Dr. Sarah Lam, the Department of Educational Leadership's 2014-15 Assessment Report will not respond to the traditional six assessment questions, but instead provide a status report of the work and assessment activity to-date and in progress.

Status of the re-development of our SOAP
The Department of Educational Leadership SOAP is currently under construction to reflect the transition to new program standards and finalization of a proposal for HEAL to be an option of the MA in Education offered at Fresno State.

<div align="center">

P-12 Educational Leadership and Administration degree and
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential pathway

</div>

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) adopted in December 2013 new Administrator Content Expectations and Performance Expectations that establish the knowledge and skills that new administrators should know and be able to do at the beginning of their administrative career. Given the important need to ensure that new administrators are prepared to help schools improve student learning and achievement and due to the significant program-level changes embodied in the new standards, the Commission is requiring all preliminary Administrative Services Credential (ASC) program sponsors, of which Fresno State is a program sponsor through the Department of Educational Leadership, to transition to the new standards by September 1, 2015, however, we had the opportunity to pilot a few of the changes in Spring 2015.

As a department, we created a course, curricula, and assessment design/redesign team that prepared our program Transition Plan (plan to plan), which was due to the CTC on September 1, 2014. Our team, known as the Academic Task Force, met almost every other week throughout the 2014-15 academic year for the purpose of designing/redesigning our curriculum, courses, delivery approaches, field experiences, and assessment with an emphasis on performance assessment. We piloted a few changes with two new Spring 2015 cohorts and full transition to the new standards and assessment begins with our three new cohorts in fall 2015. Our CTC required Program Assessment document is due to the CTC one year from full-implementation (September 1, 2016).

To-date new competency tasks/measures (content knowledge and performance assessments) have been developed in alignment with most of our new candidate/student learning outcomes, which we will begin to use this academic year (2015-16). As stated above, we did pilot a few of these measures in spring 2015 and conducted faculty feedback sessions regarding the piloted measures and student results. Some revisions were made to our competency tasks/measures based on this data, and the revised measures will be used in fall 2015.

The following are a few student of the student learning outcomes that were assessed through our pilot during the 2014-15 academic year, the competency task measures, indicators and standards of success, results, discovery from results and adjustments made based on results:

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
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. Graduates will develop knowledge and skill in the use of effective training processes and protocols to build teacher capacity in assessment literacy.	Written Paper – Unit Development (rubric) Presentation w/peer feedback and self-assessment (rubric) Video clip demonstration with explanation (rubric) Scoring Rubrics Indicator: Competent or Quality Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each criterion on scoring rubrics
Results: 42 of 46 students met indicators on first submission. One team of four (4) students was 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) more thorough discussion of baseline assessment data used to determine intervention and (b)	

visual summary of the 6-step data-driven process and PDSA cycle used to arrive at the solution and plan for continuous improvement.

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 and graduate 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.

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/ Direct Measures
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). Graduates will use information gained from the data mining process to identify improvement areas for focus and inform next step high leverage actions.	Synthesized Table (Matrix) (scoring guide/rubric) Written Analysis and Evaluation (scoring guide/rubric) Scoring Rubrics Indictor: Competent or Quality Standard: 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each criterion on scoring rubrics
Results: 40 of 46 graduates met indicators on first submission. Two groups of three graduates (total of six graduates) had to revise a portion of the task and resubmit. Areas graduates did not meet competency on first submission were: (a) written analysis and evaluation from a leadership viewpoint/perspective – graduates' analysis and evaluation was from a classroom teacher viewpoint/perspective and (b) identification of high leverage school improvement actions based on the data and information gained from data mining process and specific leadership actions (actions were derived from the data collected and made sense – matched and aligned).	

Discovery from the data and changes made as a result of these findings:
Graduates struggled with (a) considering the entire system (system perspective) over that of just their individual classrooms, and (b) taking on a high level, balcony view of a site leader. As a result of these findings, faculty will add a grounding exercise/activity that requires graduates to first map the system of the school, and examine the source of the data streams and how changes would affect the systems in place at the school.

According to the CTC, the 2013 Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards introduce a program based upon content and performance expectations, referred to as the CE and CAPE respectively. The CEs define the content that must be addressed in the Preliminary program and the CAPEs define the knowledge and skills that must be practiced and assessed during the program. The following is a program matrix and key indicating where in the program's coursework and fieldwork each expectation/learning outcome will be addressed. Fall 2015 begins the first full year of implementation and modifications will be made based on the Program Assessment Report to the CTC in September 2016. This information will be used for the re-development of our SOAP.

Key to the following matrix:

Categories:
Category for Content Expectations:
CE VI=   Content Expectation Visionary Leadership
CE IL =   Content Expectation Instructional Leadership
CE SIL =   Content Expectation School Improvement Leadership
CE PLGL=   Content Expectation Professional Learning and Growth Leadership
CE OSL =   Content Expectation Organizational and Systems Leadership
CE CL=   Content Expectation Community Leadership

C =   Competent (entry-level)
C* =   Competent (entry-level) and (*portion of expectation)
C ulm =   Competent (entry-level) and ulm (expectation assessed along the continuum, but a culminating assessment of competency occurs)

CAPES:
A-C =   Assessed as Competent (entry-level)
                Note: Where expectation is Practiced will be determined during planning and development of performance assessments
A-C* =   Assessed as Competent (entry-level) and (*portion of expectation)

Table One: The Content Expectations											
Course Titles → / Content Expectation ↓	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
CE VL-1				C							
CE VL-2				C							
CE VL-3				C							
CE VL-4				C							
CE VL-5				C							
CE VL-6				C							
CE VL-7				C							
CE VL-8				C							
CE VL-9						C					
CE VL-10				C							
CE VL-11							C				
CE VL-12							C				
CE VL-13				C							
CE VL-14							C ulm				
CE VL-15			C								
CE VL-16				C							
CE VL-17					C						
CE VL-18				C			C ulm				
CE VL-19							C ulm				
CE VL-20							C ulm				
CE IL-1							C				
CE IL-2							C				
CE IL-3		C				C					
CE IL-4	C						C ulm				
CE IL-5		C									
CE IL-6		C									
CE IL-7		C									
CE IL-8					C						
CE IL-9		C									
CE IL-10		C									
CE IL-11		C									
CE IL-12		C									
CE IL-13						C					
CE IL-14		C									
CE IL-15					C						

Table One: The Content Expectations											
Course Titles → Content Expectation ↓	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
CE IL-16					C						
CE IL-17							C				
CE IL-18		C									
CE IL-19					C						
CE IL-20		C									
CE IL-21					C						
CE IL-22		C									
CE IL-23		C									
CE IL-24		C									
CE IL-25							C ulm				
CE IL-26							C ulm				
CE IL-27							C ulm				
CE IL-28					C						
CE IL-29				C							
CE IL-30						C					
CE IL-31						C					
CE IL-32						C					
CE SIL-1				C							
CE SIL-2							C ulm				
CE SIL-3						C					
CE SIL-4							C ulm				
CE SIL -5					C						
CE SIL-6				C							
CE SIL-7				C							
CE SIL-8				C			C				
CE SIL-9				C							
CE PLGL-1					C						
CE PLGL-2				C							
CE PLGL-3							C				
CE PLGL-4							C				
CE PLGL-5					C						
CE PLGL-6					C						
CE PLGL-7					C						
CE PLGL-8							C				
CE PLGL-9				C			C				
CE PLGL-10							C				

	Table One: The Content Expectations										
Course Titles → Content Expectation ↓	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
CE PLGL-11					C		C				
CE OSL-1			C								
CE OSL-2					C						
CE OSL-3	C					C					
CE OSL-4							C ulm				
CE OSL-5							C ulm				
CE OSL-6			C								
CE OSL-7							C				
CE OSL-8					C						
CE OSL-9							C ulm				
CE OSL-10							C ulm				
CE OSL-11							C ulm				
CE OSL-12							C ulm				
CE OSL-13					C						
CE OSL-14					C						
CE OSL-15							C				
CE OSL-16					C						
CE OSL-17							C				
CE OSL-18							C				
CE OSL-19							C				
CE OSL-20							C				
CE OSL-21							C				
CE OSL-22							C ulm				
CE OSL-23							C ulm				
CE OSL-24							C				
CE OSL-25					C						
CE OSL-26					C						
CE OSL-27			C								
CE CL-1	C										
CE CL-2	C										
CE CL-3				C							
CE CL-4						C					
CE CL-5	C*		C*	C*							
CE CL-6	C*			C*							
CE CL-7							C				
CE CL-8			C								

Table One: The Content Expectations											
Course Titles → / Content Expectation ↓	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 274	EAD 269				
CE CL-9	C*	C*		C*	C*	C*	C*				
CE CL-10	C*	C*		C*		C*	C*				

Table Two: The Performance Expectations										
Course Titles → / Performance Expectation ↓	EAD 261	EAD 272	EAD 280T	EAD 274	EAD 262	EAD 263	EAD 269			
CAPE 1					A-C					
CAPE 2					A-C					
CAPE 3				A-C						
CAPE 4	A-C									
CAPE 5		A-C								
CAPE 6		A-C								
CAPE 7				A-C						
CAPE 8						A-C				
CAPE 9					A-C					
CAPE 10					A-C					
CAPE 11					A-C					
CAPE 12					A-C					
CAPE 13							A-C			
CAPE 14						A-C				
CAPE 15						A-C	A-C			
CAPE 16							A-C			
CAPE 17						A-C				

CAPE 18			A-C							
CAPE 19			A-C							
CAPE 20	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*	A-C*			

Higher Education, Administration, & Leadership (HEAL) degree pathway

Careers in higher education reflect the dynamism of colleges and universities subject to constant change. This change brings forth new opportunities in an increased demand for access to higher education, demographic change, as well as innovative pedagogies and technologies. In light of the nature of work in higher education, professionals working in the numerous positions of a college or university's organizational structure are expected to have a broad range of competencies. To meet this demand the Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership (HEAL) degree pathway prepares professionals through graduate education.

The 2014-2015 academic year marked the first full year for HEAL, welcoming 14 new students while conferring degrees to 14 graduating students. Transforming HEAL to a learning-centered graduate culture meant gathering multiple forms of meaningful and credible evidence of the ways in which students achieved program outcomes.

1. Write about national trends and issues in higher education and student affairs and the impact to their local communities (Written Communication).

2. Develop a research design incorporating basic research methodologies used in the study and practice of higher education and student affairs (Assessment and Research)

    Develop a research design incorporating basic research methodologies used in educational research [P-12] (Assessment and Research)

Outcome 1
Data for Outcome 1 (Written Communication) came from a direct assessment in EAD 261 during Fall 2014. This involved asking new students to demonstrate their competence by writing a response paper addressing current issues in higher education as a means of meeting the Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR). Results showed 86% (n=12) of HEAL students achieved this outcome and met the GWR. The other students (n=2) that did not meet the GWR did not make satisfactory academic progress and did not continue in spring 2015.

Faculty will continue assessing this outcome as it meets an important university requirement and in partnership with P-12 Educational Leadership faculty. Currently, department faculty are collaborating to develop explicit statements of what P-12 and higher education leaders should learn while verifying that the department's two curricular pathways are structured to foster this learning. This collaborative process has led the department to renew its commitment to collect empirical data that evidence student learning and to use this data to improve student learning

through continuous program improvement. Additionally, assessment of this program outcome supports student learning and program improvement related to Outcome 2.

Outcome 2
Data for Outcome 2 (Assessment and Research) came from a direct assessment in EAD 298/299 during spring 2015 (HEAL) and fall 2014/spring 2015 (P-12). Graduate students demonstrated their competence by writing a culminating project or thesis incorporating appropriate research methodologies towards the completion of a master's degree.

Results for HEAL pathway showed that 100% (n=14) satisfactorily achieved this outcome.
Results for P-12 pathway showed that 100% (n=49) satisfactorily achieved this outcome.

HEAL Program Outcomes 2015-16
Graduates will be able to:

1. Write about how the history, philosophy, and values of higher education connect to their professional practice. (Professional Foundations)

2. Explain the importance of engaging in critical reflection to identify internalized prejudices and biases. (Diversity and Inclusion)

3. Articulate the vision and mission of a functional area, division, and institution. (Organizational and Human Resources)

4. Identify and write about their personal strengths and challenges as a leader (Leadership)

Semester	Course	Program Outcomes			
		1	2	3	4
Fall 1	EAD 261	I	I		I
	EAD 278T (SA)	I	R	I	I
Spring 2	EAD 262	R		R	R
	ERE 220		R		R
	EAD 273	R			R
Fall 3	EAD 278T (Div)		E		
	EAD 266			R	
	EAD 280T		R		R
Spring 4	EAD 269	E		R	R
	EAD 298/299			E	E

Curriculum Map: I= introduced, R= reinforced, Emphasized

2015-16 Department/Across Pathways (P-12 and HEAL) Student Learning Outcome

Graduates will be able to write about national trends and issues in P-12 education/higher education and the impact on their local communities.

Graduates (P-12 and HEAL) in the Department of Educational Leadership are expected to apply effective written communication competencies to develop and implement an organizational vision, engage multiple stakeholders, and lead adult and student learning. Achieving this outcome meets the graduate writing requirement.

Department faculty (P-12 and HEAL) have 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. An analytic rubric is needed as well as an information system that documents follow-up graduate support and cohort graduate/candidate information. The information gained from an analytic rubric will not only provide the individual candidate/graduate with important information in areas for growth and improvement, but will provide cohort specific information as well. This work is 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 have been awarded a 2015 -16 Assessment Grant administered by OIE titled: Graduate Writing Competency for Educational Leaders.

Counselor Education Program

Dr. Kyle Weir, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

   The Counselor Education program assessed key learning outcomes: Crisis Intervention, Legal & Ethical Responses to Clinical Situations, Multiculturalism, and Assessing Family Strengths.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

   For the Counselor Education Program, faculty utilized the Comprehensive Examination this year.

   The Comprehensive Examination is one of the options for the culminating experience that is required for all Counseling students. The Comprehensive Examination is offered in the fall and spring semesters. The Comprehensive Examination a two-part exam. The first part is in a multiple-choice format, and, the second part is in an essay format. The Comprehensive Examination is announced at the beginning of every semester, and, interested students are invited to an orientation meeting. For students who attend the orientation meeting, they are offered an overview of the exam and the date that the exam is schedule. To be eligible to sit for the exam, students are required to have their Advancement to Candidacy either approved, or, under review. For students who pass the Comprehensive Examination, they can move forward in the manner listed in their Advancement to Candidacy. For students who do not pass the Comprehensive Examination, their progress towards graduation is delayed until they pass both sections of the exam. For 2014-2015 the Comprehensive Examination was offered in fall and spring semester with the following student totals:

   - Fall 2014
   - SACC – 8 students total - All passed all sections.
   - K-12 – 20 students total – All passed multiple choice; 19 passed (1 failed) vignette
   - MFCC/MFT – 35 students total – All passed multiple choice; 34 passed (1 failed) vignette
   - Spring 2015
   - SACC – 10 students total – All passed vignette; 8 passed (2 failed) multiple choice.
   - K-12 – 9 students total – All passed multiple choice, 5 passed (4 failed) vignette.
   - MFCC/MFT – 17 students total; 15 passed (2 failed) the multiple choice; 14 passed (3 failed) the vignette.

3. What did you discover from these results?

In the Counselor Education Program (all three options), most students are mastering the content knowledge in their respective fields as evidence by the high pass rates in the Comprehensive Examination process. It was evident that content concerning counseling skills, theory, career counseling, human development/life-span, and diagnosis were all adequately taught, understood, and demonstrated in the SLOs of the Comprehensive Examination. Pertaining to working with diversity in clinical populations, faculty discussed that while the students adequately identified diversity issues, many of the students did not specifically indicate how they would address those issues clinically. It was also clear that students need to expand their ideas of diversity beyond simply race , sexual orientation, and gender, but also need to include SES, age, religion, regional background, and so forth in their conceptualization of diversity. In COUN 201 Multicultural Counseling, curriculum needs to be modified to assist students in identifying AND addressing (i.e. what they would do differently in clinical sessions) when working with diverse populations. We also discussed that while many of the students performed adequately pertaining to crisis intervention, law and ethics responses, and assessing family strengths, most of the responses (particularly in the spring semester) were at the "barely passing" level. While it was true that we did not have an orientation review that semester that seemed to affect the students' performance, we would have hoped that they would have been better in these key areas. We identified was to ensure continuity of orientation to the comp exam next year and discussed how various courses (230, 231, 238, and 208) can place greater emphasis on those areas of concern.

Further, last year's assessment plan included efforts to move up the comp exam earlier in the Spring 2015 semester by inviting all of the Spring 2015 comp exam students to attend the Fall 2014 comp exam orientation and have the comp exams earlier in the semester. We saw a noticeable difference (drop) in the performance of the Spring 2015 comprehensive exams.

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

We determined to abandon our plan of having only one orientation per year and earlier exams in the semester. It did not work. We will go back to our previous method of comp exam orientation and delivery.

In COUN 201 Multicultural Counseling, curriculum needs to be modified to assist students in identifying AND addressing (i.e. what they would do differently in clinical sessions) when working with diverse populations. We also discussed that while many of the students performed adequately pertaining to crisis intervention, law and ethics responses, and assessing family strengths, most of the responses (particularly in the spring semester) were at the "barely passing" level. While it was true that we did not have an orientation review that semester that seemed to affect the students' performance, we would have hoped that they would have been better in these key areas. We identified the necessity of continuity of orientation to the comp exam next year and discussed how

various courses (230, 231, 238, and 208) can place greater emphasis on those areas of concern.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-2016 academic year?

    The program will continue to conduct a comprehensive exam every semester. We will also be submitting an accreditation mid-cycle report and therefore conduct a thorough assessment of the clinical review process, practicum and field placement procedures. We will also be preparing for curricular changes required 2016 CACREP Accreditation Standards.

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

    We have hired two new faculty beginning AY2015-2016 in an effort to bring our faculty to student ratio closer to CACREP accreditation compliance. We are commencing a search for another full-time faculty. As a result of our hiring efforts, CACREP granted us the remainder of the time period for accreditation (until 2019), though they urged us to continue our efforts to reduce the ratio. In terms of assessment, CACREP was pleased with out assessment process.

Rehabilitation Counseling Program

Dr. Jenelle Pitt, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

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

The program assessed two goals across three objectives encompassing writing competencies and ethical conduct in relation to rehabilitation counseling professional identity (e.g., *What does it mean to be an ethical rehabilitation counseling professional?).*

According to the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (SOAP) listed on the university website, the goals and objectives were as follows:

Goal 2. Rehabilitation Counseling Students will demonstrate writing that is grammatically correct, concise, clear, organized, comprehensive, and when applicable, meets the APA style and format of writing. Students will:

Objective 2.1. Write consumer reports that contain pertinent client information that are grammatically correct, concise, clear, and comprehensive. (Fall 2014)

Objective 2.2. Write literature reviews or papers reflective of rehabilitation counseling knowledge that reflects critical thinking and is concise, clear, and comprehensive. (Spring 2015)

Goal 3. Rehabilitation Counseling Students will demonstrate ethical conduct and professional identity that reflects the rehabilitation counseling profession. Students will:

Objective 3.1. Identify and apply ethical principles to analyze and resolve potential ethical dilemmas. (Fall 2014)

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

The program used a variety of instruments including global data from (a) our comprehensive examination, (b) a clinical review assessment form from the Counselor Education Program (Note: Faculty from both the Rehabilitation Counseling Program and the Counselor Education Program have clinically reviewed students enrolled in programs throughout the Department of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation), and (c) SOAP rubrics (i.e., Rehab 268C-Service Delivery Rubric [Fall 2014]; Rehab 239-Internship Student Evaluation Items D1, D2, D3 [Fall 2014]; Writing Rubric #2 from Rehab 201, 205, 206, and 211 [Spring 2015]).

3. What did you discover from these data? Data from Rehab 201, Rehab 205, Rehab 206, and Rehab 211 utilizing Writing Rubric #2 suggests that students are demonstrating enhanced writing competencies. Specifically, in Rehab 201, mean scores for content (X=3) and grammar (X=2.85) denotes that students (N=7) are scoring mostly in the "Accomplished" range. A score

of 2 suggests "Capable" range. For this particular course, students were provided with several resources including guidelines, sample papers, and websites that house scholarly resources in order to develop APA style abstracts.

In Rehab 205, mean scores for content (X=2.71) and grammar (X=2.42) suggests that students (N=7) are approaching the "Accomplished" range, but are closer to the "Capable" range, demonstrating the need to enhance grammatical skills needed to develop various resumes (e.g., chronological, functional, etc.) for clients.

Relative to Rehab 206, mean scores in content (X=3) and grammar/format (X=3) denote that students (N=9) are scoring in the "Accomplished" range relative to discussing issues of diversity, multiculturalism, and psychosocial issues related to living with a disability. The majority of students asked questions prior to submitting assignments and took advantage of outside writing resources.

In Rehab 211, mean scores in content (X=2.6) and grammar/format (X=2.8) suggest that students (N=5) are demonstrating knowledge and skills more closely in the "Accomplished" range when it comes to writing about ethics and other professional issues in the field. Some students sought out additional support via the Writing Center where they received assistance with the content and overall structure of their papers. There were some students who did not participate in any outside writing resource assistance or request feedback/direction from the instructor.

In Rehab 268C, mean scores in content (X=3) and grammar/format (X=3) denote that students (N=4) are scoring in the "Accomplished" range relative to resume development content, resume development grammar, job leads content, and linkages content (linking clients to community resources).

In Rehab 239, in the area of case recording and report writing, for item D1 (reports are concise and well constructed), 81% of students (N=13) scored at a level of "5" suggesting performance was above the standard required for a competent student or new employee. For item D2 (reports are easy to comprehend and contain pertinent information), 88% (N=14) scored at a level "5." For item D3 (overall quality of reports), 88% (N=14) scored at level "5." This superior performance is also supported by the fact that 7 students were presented with offers of employment prior to completing their internship experience. One student was accepted into a doctoral program.

Using data from the clinical review tool to assess ethical behaviors of master's level rehabilitation counseling trainees, 100% of students (N=8) scored at level "5" relative to "attention to ethical and legal considerations," under the Professional Behaviors section. As this tool was used in Rehab 238 (e.g., rehabilitation counseling practicum, where the instructor can assess actual behaviors), the program had an opportunity to assess the *application* of knowledge and skills in the ethical realm while students counseled clients from the community.

Using data from the comprehensive examination, during Fall 2014, 16 students took the examination, in which 10 passed resulting in a 63% pass rate. In Spring 2015, 16 students took

the examination, in which 16 passed resulting in 100% pass rate. During the Fall and Spring examinations, students were presented with ethical dilemmas that involved diversity issues including but not limited to race, sexuality, religion/spirituality, age, personal/professional values, and education in which they were responsible for writing about the cultural, legal, ethical, and clinical factors associated with the case.

Students are strongly encouraged to meet with their advisors prior to registering for and taking the examination in order to review necessary accommodations that might be needed through Services to Students with Disabilities, assess strengths and weaknesses (e.g., knowledge of content, but being able to succinctly demonstrate knowledge and skills within a specific time frame for the exam), discuss test-taking strategies (e.g., practice engaging in timed writing responses), etc.

For any failed attempt, students must meet with program faculty prior to re-registering for the examination. Students are also provided with a packet of material including scholarly resources, sample questions, and student responses-all identifying information is removed (questions from previous years are not in rotation to appear on the examination; prior student responses are offered, so that students obtain an idea for the type of depth and citing of resources they need to produce in a specific amount of time). Students are strongly encouraged to attend a review session in order to gain familiarity with the structure of the examination and knowledge domains, which aligns with the national certification examination for rehabilitation counselors. The knowledge domains for the national exam can be accessed via the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC) website https://www.crccertification.com/

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

Full and part-time faculty are working hard to emphasize content and foundational skills (e.g., writing). As a program, we have decided to continue highlighting this emphasis at our program orientation, in our respective advising meetings with students, and in our individual classes. The program has a very active advisory board, which meets twice throughout the academic year. The program presents our comprehensive examination results, and also engages in lively discussion regarding foundational skills (e.g., writing, problem-solving, conflict resolution, oral communication, etc.) and curricular content changes (e.g., Are there gaps in knowledge or skills set that you are seeing among students who are in engaging in practicum, internship, or as new employees?). We have found that we need to keep the conversations between faculty and community partners/prospective employers going as it is beneficial in assessing and further shaping our learning outcomes.

The program is still in the process of revising the comprehensive examination process. Nationally, some rehabilitation counseling programs are offering the national CRC examination as the program's comprehensive examination. This is a direction that is still being discussed for the Rehabilitation Counseling Program at Fresno State. In the interim, the program is seeking to finalize whether students will be offered only an essay portion or essay and multiple-choice sections in alignment with the 10 domains on the national examination. The program is also

vetting the idea of moving towards a portfolio comprehensive examination as supplemented with an oral defense.

Many of the instructors (part and full-time) integrate community partners into their class sessions on a regular basis. The program plans to continue these efforts, as community partners (ones who work with practicum/internship students and hire students as new employees) are able to reinforce content and the importance of possessing and translating foundational skills (i.e., writing, oral communication, case recording/documentation, etc.) in the *real world*.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-16 academic year? While the program is continuing to think through how we can revise our SOAPS and consult with university assessment personnel, at present, we are scheduled to assess Objective 3.2 using data from Rehab 211, Rehab 237, and Rehab 239 in the area of understanding client behaviors as a form of ethical performance. We are also scheduled to review/revise our comprehensive examination, which we are already diligently working on; as such, our efforts will continue.

6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan? The Rehabilitation Counseling Program at Fresno State received a one-year extension relative to accreditation by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE). Consequently, the program is fully accredited until August 31, 2018. The program submits annual reports to CORE to determine whether accreditation should continue through 2018. Based on a review of the 2014-2015 Annual Report, CORE "found no reason to add additional conditions to assure continued appliance with the CORE standards for Rehabilitation Counselor Education Programs. Subsequently, in official session on July 18, 2015, the Council on Rehabilitation Education approved continuation of your program's accreditation" (CORE correspondence, 2015).

We are continuing to use pass rates on the comprehensive examination as a key indicator of student learning and closing the loop. The majority of students enrolled in the program choose the examination as their culminating experience. Data from the examination aids the program in highlighting areas of strength and weaknesses (e.g., where are students performing well; where is additional support needed; what are faculty doing well; how can assignments be restructured; do we need to improve relative to student-instructor interaction, content, etc.). The Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) continues to offer the Rehabilitation Counseling Program information relative to program outcomes and overall student learning.

Another area of achievement is the pass rate on the national examination. During the 2013-2014 academic year, students enrolled in the program experienced 57% pass rate on the first attempt. While, the examination entity has changed its practices, and the program now has to rely on students relaying information of whether they passed or did not pass with supplemental documentation, the program's in-house data collection system reflects that the pass rate has increased by 3%. Preparation sessions being conducted by a faculty member, and the joint emphasis on professional identity by all faculty members is leading to an increase in pass rates.

More students are also being invited to work on manuscripts being submitted for publication, grants being submitted for funding, and involvement in student leadership and community-based

activities, which the program thinks is buttressing efforts in the classroom, and impacting student knowledge and foundational learning outcomes.

Reading/Language Arts Program

Dr. Imelda Basurto, Coordinator

<p style="text-align:center;">OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT</p>

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Reading/Language Arts Program assessed the following outcomes during the 2014-15 year:

- Goal 1: To prepare graduates to be knowledgeable about literacy development and instructional practices through the study of theoretical perspectives and scientific research on literacy processes and language development.

  Outcomes: Graduates will be able to:
  1.1 Compare and contrast major theories of literacy and language development
  1.2 Apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons

- Goal 2: To prepare graduates with the capacity to plan, implement, evaluate, and modify literacy instruction to meet the needs of diverse struggling readers and English Language Learners.

  Outcomes: Graduates will be able to:
  2.1 Design differentiated instructional strategies based on student assessment results.
  2.2 Provide effective clinical literacy instruction to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse struggling readers.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

The following instruments were used to assess the learning outcomes:

- Assessment 1: Comprehensive Exam (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)
- Assessment 2: Theory to Practice Project (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2)
- Assessment 3: Case Study Report (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1)
- Assessment 4: Literature Review Method (Outcome 1.1)
- Assessment 5: Practicum Experience Matrix Method (Outcome 1.2, 2.1, 2.2)

3. What did you discover from these results?

- Outcome 1.1: Several assessment measures indicate some strengths and some weaknesses for students in their ability to compare and contrast major literacy development theories in a research paper. Two out of two students passed the comprehensive exam. On the 278 question mean rubric domain scores ranged from 3.17-3.67 on a 4-point scale. The

Theory to Practice Project (LEE 213) however, scores indicate that 30% excelled, 43% did well with some modeling, and 27% struggled with format and organization as well as integrating research into their papers. In the Wiki Project (LEE 244) 89% of students met or exceeded requirements, with 11% needing help.

- Outcome 1.2: Both assessment measures, Case Study Report (LEE 224) and Theory to Practice Project (LEE 213), indicate that students need more scaffolding to clearly apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons. The Case Study Report shows that 20% of students excelled, 46% did well with some modeling, and 12% needed a lot of scaffolding while 12% failed the assignment.

- Outcome 2.1: The results of the assessment measures for this outcome were mixed. While The Case Study Report (LEE 224) indicates that students are struggling in their ability to use assessment results to design appropriate differentiated instruction, the Practicum Experience Matrix (LEE 230) shows 66% of students excelling at this task with 93% meeting requirements.

- Outcome 2.2: The results of the assessment measure for this outcome according to the Practicum Experience Matrix (LEE 230) that 40% of students provide effective literacy instruction for diverse and struggling readers, with 60% needing guidance and modeling to achieve effective instruction.

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

Curriculum revisions have been developed to strengthen students' performances relative to each of the outcomes and these changes will be implemented in 2015-16.

- Outcome 1.1: Faculty reviewed the Theory to Practice Project and the Case Study report and determined that students need extensive modeling on how to research and write a research paper with focus on organization, format, and integrating research. Faculty will be providing more models and more scaffolding for the writing process in 2015-2016.

- Outcome 1.2: Faculty determined that struggling students should be encouraged to attend the writing center and that more emphasis should be placed on incorporating research into lesson design. Faculty will be referring struggling students to the writing center and emphasizing research based lesson design in 2015-2016.

- Outcome 2.1: Faculty determined that the program needs to put more of an emphasis on differentiating instruction. Faculty will be incorporating lessons on differentiation and providing practice in their classes in 2015-2016.

- Outcome 2.2: Faculty determined that there needs to more modeling and guidance on how to provide effective literacy instruction to diverse and struggling readers. Faculty will demonstrate, show examples and discuss methods of literacy instruction in 2015-2016.

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

    a. *LEE 213 Theory to Practice Project.* (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2)
    b. *LEE 224 Case Study Report.* (Outcomes 2.1)
    c. *LEE 230 Practicum Experience Matrix* (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2)
    d. *LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report. (*Outcomes 3.2*)*
    e. *LEE 254 Coaching Presentation Rubric (*Outcomes 3.1*)*
    f. *Comprehensive Exam.* (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)
    g. *Alumni Survey* (Outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 3.2)

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

    - Based on our action plan from last year, which included revising the Comprehensive Exam questions, we closely reviewed and revised the Comprehensive Exam questions so that expectations were clearly outlined for students. More specifically, questions 5 and 6 for LEE 224 were revised as well as questions 9 and 10 for LEE 278.

    - 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.

Special Education MA Program Report

Dr. Elisa Jamgochian, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

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

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 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 instructional strategies, activities, and content that address diverse student interests, utilize individual strengths, and accommodate various styles of communication and learning and align with 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.
2.2: collaborate and communicate effectively with administrators, school colleagues, support staff, 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: understand laws and regulations related to individuals with disabilities and their families and demonstrate advocacy skills
3.2: apply and reflect on ethical standards to his or her professional conduct
3.3: 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.

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

If this does not align with the outcomes and activities detailed in the timeline of the SOAP, please provide an explanation of this discrepancy. If the standards for student performance are not included in your SOAP, you should include them here. For example "On outcome 2.3, 80% of students will score an average of 3.5 out of 5 on the attached rubric."

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 Preliminary and the candidate exits Special Education Program at Clear. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. 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 Preliminary and Clear. University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. 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 will be used to evaluate our candidates' writing, understanding of literature review, and data reporting in SPED 233. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Fall 2013 – $n = 22$ | mean = 182.7 | max = 200 | range = 152-200
Spring 2014 – (section 1) $n = 19$ | mean = 93.11 | max = 100 | range = 80-99
Spring 2014 – (section 2) $n = 19$ | mean = 93.53 | max = 100 | range = 88-98

Research Proposal – The final project for SPED 243 is a Research Proposal. Students are expected to engage in an iterative process of writing. Each section draft is worth 10 points; the complete draft (for writing group review) is worth 20 points, and the final draft is worth 20 points [70 points total]. Students must keep and submit all drafts and group feedback. Broadly, the proposal will contain:
3. Introduction: General statement of the problem, including background and significance; hypotheses/research questions
4. Literature review (revise/build upon draft from SPED 233, if same topic)
5. Methods: Description of participants and setting; research design; data sources; dependent variables (where relevant); instrumentation (where relevant); processes and procedures (proposed data collection and analysis); anticipated results (where relevant)
6. Discussion: Limitations; importance; contribution to the field

*This assignment has been adapted to meet the needs of individual student projects.

Fall 2013 – $n = 4$ | mean = 70 | max = 70
Spring 2014 - – awaiting data/results from instructor (not available via Blackboard)

Intervention Project* [Special Education Teaching Sample Project] – In SPED 246, students 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.
Fall 2013
Part 1 $n = 18$ | mean = 24.61 | max = 26 | range = 21-26
Part 2 $n = 18$ | mean = 23.06 | max = 25 | range = 19-25
Part 3 $n = 18$ | mean = 34.67 | max = 38 | range = 20-38
Parts 4 + 5 $n = 18$ | mean = 50.44 | max = 51 | range = 41-51

Spring 2014
Part 1 $n = 21$ | mean = 23.87| max = 26 | range = 20-26
Part 2 $n = 21$ | mean = 23.52 | max = 25 | range = 17.5-25
Part 3 $n = 21$ | mean = 36.43 | max = 38 | range = 20.5-38
Part 4 $n = 21$ | mean = 24.76 | max = 25 | range = 20-25
Part 5 $n = 21$ | mean = 24.51 | max = 25 | range = 5-26

Social Integration Plan** – Students in SPED 247 complete a project for which they reflect on and identify the ways in which they are supporting the development of social relationships and

the active integration of a focus student into classroom and school environments. Based on observations and use of the ecological tools presented in class, students are scored on their ability to identify and describe effective strategies that support relationship development and integration for the focus student. In addition, students are evaluated on their plan to support relationship development/active participation for your focus student in *two* areas utilizing evidence-based practices.

Spring 2014 (course offered once per year)* This assignment has been modified to focus on communication. Students complete three projects related to supporting students' communication needs.

1. The Communication Plan – $n = 18$ | mean = 69.83 | max = 75 | range 45 – 75

2. The Communication Matrix Project – $n = 18$ | mean = 99.17 | max = 120 | range 45 – 120

    7. Picture Exchange Project – $n = 18$ | mean = 331.94| max = 370 | range 255 – 370

Portfolio – The portfolio is divided into three sections. The first section includes the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms. The second section includes materials or artifacts demonstrating student competency and ability to perform as a special education teacher. The third section contains the Program Completion Forms. This portfolio is designed to examine the products of students' learning throughout graduate Special Education Program. 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. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Fall 2013 – $n = 18$ | mean = 92.26 | max = 100 | range 70 – 100

Spring 2014 – $n = 14$ | mean = 88.19 | max = 100 | range 18.5 – 100

Masters Project/Thesis – 298 Project includes 2 components: (1) project report including Chapter 1: Introduction, Chapter 2: Review of the Literature, and Chapter 3: Summary and Recommendations, and (2) project component. 299 Thesis contains (1) Chapter 1: Introduction, Chapter 2: Review of Literature, Chapter 3: Methodology, Chapter 4: Results, and Chapter 5: Discussion. A rubric is used by faculty to measure the quality of specific traits of the project/thesis. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Fall 2013 – Students continuing (1)
SPED 298 (EJ) – $n = 4$ | average rubric score 4/4;
SPED 298 (CT) – $n = 6$ | average rubric score 3.12/4;
SPED 298 (HS)

Spring 2014 - Students continuing (1)
SPED 298 (EJ) – $n = 8$ | average rubric score 3.875/4;
SPED 298/299 (CT) – $n = 2$ | average rubric score 3.13/4;
SPED 298 (HS)

<u>Candidate Dispositions</u> – 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.

SPED 236 | Spring 2014 – $n = 12$ | mean per dispositional category presented below (out of 4)
- Reflection = 3.60
- Critical Thinking = 3.52
- Professional Ethics = 3.80
- Valuing Diversity = 3.59
- Collaboration = 3.69
- Life-long learning = 3.31

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

First, it is evident that we need to look at our methods for data collection, and perhaps consider a more centralized way in which to collect data for each of these measures (e.g., online via Google Forms).

Given the results we do have for some of the assessments above, students are typically performing at or above 80% on each. One noted area of strength includes overall student performance on formative assessments (portfolio). Students also do well in self- and supervisor ratings of dispositional characteristics. Overall, the scores for one category within Life-Long Learning indicate that perhaps we need to support students in finding opportunities to present to parents and/or colleagues in an area of expertise. Anecdotally, students may also need additional support throughout the MA courses related to APA writing standards.

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

Based on the results above, we will be implementing a streamlined way in which to collect data. This year, we will pilot the use of Google Forms for this purpose. In addition, we will make an effort to collect both quantitative and qualitative data (including anecdotal), so that we have a better picture of student performance.

We will continue to meet and discuss student progress regularly during program meetings at least once in each semester to discuss issues related to outcomes assessment and make necessary changes. In the process of assessment, teaching and evaluation, assessment activities, such as measurement development, data analysis, proposed program changes, and 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.

10. *What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2014-15 academic year?*

The same learning outcomes and assessments will be used. Where noted previously, adaptations to assignments will continue, taking the place of those noted in the SOAP.

SPED Program Data Collection Timeline 2013-2016				
Assessment Measure	Type of Instrument	Data Collected By	Frequency of Data Collection	Data Aggregated By
Candidate Program Evaluation	Survey	SPED Coordinator	Each Semester	SPED Coordinator
Employer Program Evaluation	Survey	University Supervisors	Each Semester	SPED Coordinator
Assessment Measure	Type of Instrument	Data Collected By	Frequency of Data Collection	Data Aggregated By
Evaluation of Candidate Writing Requirement	Writing Rubric (SPED 233)	SPED Faculty	Fall Semester	SPED 233 Instructor
Evaluation of Candidate Research Proposal Writing *Adapted to meet the needs of individual student projects.	Rubric (SPED 243)	SPED Faculty	Spring Semester	SPED 243 Instructor
Evaluation of Candidate Intervention Teaching Sample Project	Scoring Guidelines (SPED 246)	SPED Faculty	Each Semester	SPED 246 Instructor
Evaluation of Candidate Social Integration Plan Communication Projects (3)	Scoring Guidelines (SPED 247)	SPED Faculty	Each Semester offered	SPED 247 Instructor
Evaluation of	Rubrics	SPED Faculty	Each Semester	Candidate Advisor

Candidate Project/ Thesis				
Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions	Survey	Program Faculty (SPED 175/176 & 289/299)	Appropriate Semester per candidate	SPED Coordinator

11. *What progress have you made on items from your 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.

Early Childhood Education Program Report

Dr. Cathy K. Yun, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESMENT REPORT

What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Early Childhood Education Program assessed all outcomes during the 2014-15 year. Those outcomes are:

Goal A: ECE graduates utilize theory, research, and ongoing assessment when making instructional decisions. To that end, students:
Objective A-1: Demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions that promote development and learning.
Objective A-2: Apply current ECE research to issues of practice.
Objective A-3: Utilize a variety of inquiry methods and the latest technology.

Goal B: ECE graduates are caring and ethical teacher-leaders, guided by their knowledge of culturally and developmentally appropriate practices. To that end, students:
Objective B-1: Engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment and life-long learning.

Goal C: ECE graduates are leaders who address the needs of their culturally diverse learners respectfully and responsively. To that end, students:
Objective C-1: Integrate various perspectives to create quality early education for all children.
        Objective C-2: Be responsive to ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity.

Goal D: Develop interprofessional skills necessary to become ECE leaders in both the educational community and in the community at large. To that end, students:
Objective D-1: Build strong relationships with families and communities.
Objective D-2: Advocate for children, families, and the profession.

7.   What instruments 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 A
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio evaluated Goals A, B, C, and D
- Assessment 3: Charter School Project evaluated Goals A and C
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity evaluated Goal D
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity evaluated Goal A
- (pilot year) Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity was developed to evaluate Goals B, C, and D

8. What did you discover from these results?

Relative to Goal A, there were mixed assessment results. Analysis of the Action Research Project 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. Students who completed a Project or Thesis demonstrated at a high level their ability to apply current research to issues of practice and to use a variety of inquiry methods whereas students who completed the Comprehensive Exam met the goal at a minimum level of proficiency. Student performance on the Comprehensive Exam must be examined in relation to the exam prompts and rubric. The Comprehensive Exam prompts and rubrics need further revision and refining.

Relative to Goal B, the Field Portfolio assessment indicates students are able to engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment, and life-long learning. The piloted Dispositions and Ethics Activity 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.

Relative to Goal C, the Portfolio assessment 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 assessment.

Relative to Goal D, students' performances were strong in the areas of leadership and advocacy as measured by the Leadership Activity and the Portfolio assessment. It is believed that a course devoted to leadership and advocacy in ECE (LEE250), which is now a core (required) course, significantly impacted students' performance. Scores on the new Dispositions and Ethics Activity also showed that students were able to recognize the importance of building relationships with families and communities as well as advocate for children.

9. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?

Changes in assessment instruments, rubrics, and curriculum have been made throughout the year to strengthen students' performances relative to each of the goals.

- Goal A: The rubrics for the Comprehensive Exam, Field Portfolio, Charter School Project, and Action Research Activity were revised and realigned to the NAEYC standards and key elements, as appropriate vis-à-vis the program goals. The revised rubrics more clearly articulate the alignment between assessments and student demonstration of connections between theory and practice, including appropriate uses of technology. 2015-16 plans include ongoing ECE Comprehensive Exam prompt and rubric revisions.

- Goal B: A new Dispositions and Ethics Activity was developed and piloted to provide data for Goals B, C, and D. This new assessment focuses on application of the NAEYC Professional Code of Ethics for the ECE field, including reflections on advocacy,

relationship building with families, and community engagement. This new assessment will be refined in 2015-16.

- Goal C: The Charter School Project and rubric were revised and realigned to the NAEYC standards and key elements. The revised assessment and rubric will be piloted and refined in 2015-16.

- Goal D: Assessments and rubrics for the Field Portfolio and the Leadership Activity were revised and realigned with the NAEYC standards and key elements. The revised assessment and rubric will be piloted and refined in 2015-16.

In addition the data collection system was reexamined and revised. A new, shared database was established to give faculty members access and flexibility in documenting their respective assessment scores. New procedures for documenting and analyzing data each semester were negotiated and agreed upon.

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

Six assessments will be used to evaluate student performance relative to the four goals:
- Assessment 1: Project/Thesis or Comprehensive Exam will evaluate Goal A
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio will evaluate Goals A, B, C, and D
- Assessment 3: Charter School Project will evaluate Goals A and C
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity will evaluate Goal D
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity will evaluate Goal A
- Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity will evaluate Goals B, C, and D

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

Our program participated in an accreditation review process in which it was evaluated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) during the 2013-14 school year. This review indicated that all standards, which are aligned with our SOAP outcomes, were met but some of the standards were met provisionally with conditions. As part of the second review process, our program undertook revisions for all signature assessments and rubrics. We will continue to engage in the work if continuous program improvement, based on our SOAP and NAEYC standards, to identify areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions. This process supports us in sustaining a program of high quality.

Multilingual Multicultural Education Program Report

Dr. Tony Vang, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Multilingual Multicultural Education Program (MME) has five major goals in its program which are listed in the SOAP as Goals A-E. However, because this new program recently began in Spring 2014 and only three courses have been taught (LEE 281, LEE 282 and LEE 283), two objectives (A-1 and A-2) in Goal A were assessed for this report. The goal and outcome objectives are the following:

Goal A: MM graduates utilize essential skills in designing, planning, and implementing critical pedagogy in multilingual and cross-cultural settings.

- Objective A-1. Explain critical pedagogy in either a 1st or 2^{nd}language.
- Objective A-2. Demonstrate culturally responsive practices in teaching LCD learners.

The other four goals (see SOAP, 2014) will be addressed as more classes are taught in the MME Program.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

Three instruments were used to assess Objectives 1 -7 on Case Study, Research paper presentation and final Research Paper.

These instruments are requirements for LEE 282 course in order to assess student outcomes:

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

3. What did you discover from these results?

In reference to the instruments used to assess Goal A, 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 for 2014-15. 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 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.

Liberal Studies

Dr. Susan Schlievert, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

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.
While each outcome is discussed annually, the emphasis and formal assessment for 2014-2015 addressed Content.

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

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: Students are not obligated to report CSET scores, but passing scores are required for final student teaching. In consultation with credential faculty, we found that the data and

personal interviews showed an area of need. There were students who needed to re-take and pass the CSET tests 1, 2, 3, or all.
•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: This component is the most difficult to assess because CSET scores 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 MALLER 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?

Describe what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.
•1. Content: The LSRC and faulty groups discussed the findings. Face-to-face CSET preparation classes were promoted (in conjunction with Fresno Unified) 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.
•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 2015-16 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 2015-2016 will be to examine portfolios for ENGL 117W (lower division writing sample requirement) and 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

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

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

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 Projects (Client Evaluation)
    1. Qualifying Exam (Problems of Practice) (Rubrics)
    2. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Preliminary Defense)(Rubrics)
    3. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Final Defense) (Rubrics)
    4. Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey)
Indirect Measures
    1. Faculty Annual Review of Student Progress (based on Dispositions)(Survey)
    2. Town Hall Meetings
    3. Graduate Survey
    4. Employer Survey
    5. External Review of Dissertations (Rubric)

What did you discover from the data?
- Client field work surveys need to be redeveloped to be more closely aligned with student learning outcomes and program outcomes.
- 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.
- The Administrator Disposition Index is a 360 survey; 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). Although students continue to complete their pre and post surveys, we have found it difficult to collect the work colleague surveys, particularly post program. Students' post-survey results reveal that 59.09% plan to implement an education reform that is a significant deviation from past practice. Approximately 54% of graduates reported being better able to meet their professional and career goals and 50% reported that DPELFS improved their networking and professional opportunities. More than 80% of graduates rated the following statements as "high" or "very high": Able to access current literature relevant to educational leadership; Use a variety of research methodologies to investigate school/organizational effectiveness; Undertake program evaluations in school/organizations; Undertake assessments in schools/organizations; provide educational leadership through conducting research; Improve my ability to provide educational leadership by taking appropriate actions to implement proposed solutions; Analyze the implications of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual issues in educational settings; Engage in continuous professional growth and life-long learning.
- Due to a change in leadership, Town Meetings were not held during this academic year.

What changes did you make as a result of the findings?
- DPELFS faculty have developed a new Embedded Field Work Client Evaluation
- The DPELFS Graduate Faculty Group adopted a new policy for administering the Qualitative Exam. Faculty will work together to develop study guide for core coursework
- Town Hall meeting are scheduled to occur in the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

What assessment activities will you be conducting in 2015-16 academic year?
The DPELFS measure all of the program and student outcomes on a continual basis. The 2015-2016 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 to rigorously and concisely measure progress toward the new revised outcomes. The technical qualities of the instruments used will also be evaluated where applicable.

What progress have you made on items from your last program review?
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 reviewer.

Counselor Education Program Learning Outcomes Assessment
2014-2015

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT:

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Counselor Education program assessed key learning outcomes: Crisis Intervention, Legal
& Ethical Responses to Clinical Situations, Multiculturalism, and Assessing Family Strengths.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

For the Counselor Education Program, faculty utilized the Comprehensive Examination this year.

The Comprehensive Examination is one of the options for the culminating experience that is required for all
Counseling students. The Comprehensive Examination is offered in the fall and spring semesters. The
Comprehensive Examination a two-part exam. The first part is in a multiple-choice format, and, the second part
is in an essay format. The Comprehensive Examination is announced at the beginning of every semester, and,
interested students are invited to an orientation meeting. For students who attend the orientation meeting, they
are offered an overview of the exam and the date that the exam is schedule. To be eligible to sit for the exam,
students are required to have their Advancement to Candidacy either approved, or, under review. For students
who pass the Comprehensive Examination, they can move forward in the manner listed in their Advancement
to Candidacy. For students who do not pass the Comprehensive Examination, their progress towards
graduation is delayed until they pass both sections of the exam. For 2014-2015 the Comprehensive
Examination was offered in fall and spring semester with the following student totals:

- Fall 2014
  - SACC – 8 students total - All passed all sections.

  - K-12 – 20 students total – All passed multiple choice; 19 passed (1
    failed) vignette
  - MFCC/MFT – 35 students total – All passed multiple choice; 34 passed (1
    failed) vignette
- Spring 2015
  - SACC – 10 students total – All passed vignette; 8 passed (2 failed)
    multiple choice.
  - K-12 – 9 students total – All passed multiple choice, 5 passed (4 failed)
    vignette.
  - MFCC/MFT – 17 students total; 15 passed (2 failed) the multiple choice;
    14 passed (3 failed) the vignette.

3. What did you discover from these results?

In the Counselor Education Program (all three options), most students are mastering the content knowledge in their respective fields as evidence by the high pass rates in the Comprehensive Examination process. It was evident that content concerning counseling skills, theory, career counseling, human development/life-span, and diagnosis were all adequately taught, understood, and demonstrated in the SLOs of the Comprehensive Examination. Pertaining to working with diversity in clinical populations, faculty discussed that while the students adequately identified diversity issues, many of the students did not specifically indicate how they would address those issues clinically. It was also clear that students need to expand their ideas of diversity beyond simply race , sexual orientation, and gender, but also need to include SES, age, religion, regional background, and so forth in their conceptualization of diversity. In COUN 201 Multicultural Counseling, curriculum needs to be modified to assist students in *identifying* AND *addressing* (i.e. what they would do differently in clinical sessions) when working with diverse populations. We also discussed that while many of the students performed adequately pertaining to crisis intervention, law and ethics responses, and assessing family strengths, most of the responses (particularly in the spring semester) were at the "barely passing" level. While it was true that we did not have an orientation review that semester that seemed to affect the students' performance, we would have hoped that they would have been better in these key areas. We identified was to ensure continuity of orientation to the comp exam next year and discussed how various courses (230, 231, 238, and 208) can place greater emphasis on those areas of concern.

Further, last year's assessment plan included efforts to move up the comp exam earlier in the Spring 2015 semester by inviting all of the Spring 2015 comp exam students to attend the Fall 2014 comp exam orientation and have the comp exams earlier in the semester. We saw a noticeable difference (drop) in the performance of the Spring 2015 comprehensive exams.

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

We determined to abandon our plan of having only one orientation per year and earlier exams in the semester. It did not work. We will go back to our previous method of comp exam orientation and delivery.

In COUN 201 Multicultural Counseling, curriculum needs to be modified to assist students in *identifying* AND *addressing* (i.e. what they would do differently in clinical sessions) when working with diverse populations. We also discussed that while many of the students performed adequately pertaining to crisis intervention, law and ethics responses, and assessing family strengths, most of the responses (particularly in the spring semester) were at the "barely passing" level. While it was true that we did not have an orientation review that semester that seemed to affect the students' performance, we would have hoped that they would have been better in these key areas. We identified the necessity of continuity of orientation to the comp exam next year and discussed how various courses (230, 231, 238, and 208) can place greater emphasis on those areas of concern.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-2016 academic year?

The program will continue to conduct a comprehensive exam every semester. We will also be submitting an accreditation mid-cycle report and therefore conduct a thorough assessment of the clinical review process, practicum and field placement procedures. We will also be preparing for curricular changes required 2016 CACREP Accreditation Standards.

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

We have hired two new faculty beginning AY2015-2016 in an effort to bring our faculty to student ratio closer to CACREP accreditation compliance. We are commencing a search for another full-time faculty. As a result of our hiring efforts, CACREP granted us the remainder of the time period for accreditation (until 2019), though they urged us to continue our efforts to reduce the ratio. In terms of assessment, CACREP was pleased with out assessment process.

Early Childhood Education Program Report, 2014-2015

Cathy K. Yun, Coordinator

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Early Childhood Education Program assessed all outcomes during the 2014-15 year. Those outcomes are:

Goal A: ECE graduates utilize theory, research, and ongoing assessment when making instructional decisions. To that end, students:
> **Objective A-1**: Demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions that promote development and learning.
> **Objective A-2**: Apply current ECE research to issues of practice.
> **Objective A-3**: Utilize a variety of inquiry methods and the latest technology.

Goal B: ECE graduates are caring and ethical teacher-leaders, guided by their knowledge of culturally and developmentally appropriate practices. To that end, students:
> **Objective B-1**: Engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment and life-long learning.

Goal C: ECE graduates are leaders who address the needs of their culturally diverse learners respectfully and responsively. To that end, students:
> **Objective C-1**: Integrate various perspectives to create quality early education for all children.
> **Objective C-2**: Be responsive to ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity.

Goal D: Develop interprofessional skills necessary to become ECE leaders in both the educational community and in the community at large. To that end, students:
> **Objective D-1**: Build strong relationships with families and communities.
> **Objective D-2**: Advocate for children, families, and the profession.

2. What instruments 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 A
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio evaluated Goals A, B, C, and D
- Assessment 3: Charter School Project evaluated Goals A and C
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity evaluated Goal D
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity evaluated Goal A
- (pilot year) Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity was developed to evaluate Goals B, C, and D

3. What did you discover from these results?

Relative to Goal A, there were mixed assessment results. Analysis of the Action Research Project 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. Students who completed a Project or Thesis demonstrated at a high level their ability to apply current research to issues of practice and to use a variety of inquiry methods whereas students who completed the Comprehensive Exam met the goal at a minimum level of proficiency. Student performance on the Comprehensive Exam must be examined in relation to the exam prompts and rubric. The Comprehensive Exam prompts and rubrics need further revision and refining.

Relative to Goal B, the Field Portfolio assessment indicates students are able to engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment, and life-long learning. The piloted Dispositions and Ethics Activity 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.

Relative to Goal C, the Portfolio assessment 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 assessment.

Relative to Goal D, students' performances were strong in the areas of leadership and advocacy as measured by the Leadership Activity and the Portfolio assessment. It is believed that a course devoted to leadership and advocacy in ECE (LEE250), which is now a core (required) course, significantly impacted students' performance. Scores on the new Dispositions and Ethics Activity also showed that students were able to recognize the importance of building relationships with families and communities as well as advocate for children.

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

Changes in assessment instruments, rubrics, and curriculum have been made throughout the year to strengthen students' performances relative to each of the goals.

- Goal A: The rubrics for the Comprehensive Exam, Field Portfolio, Charter School Project, and Action Research Activity were revised and realigned to the NAEYC standards and key elements, as appropriate vis-à-vis the program goals. The revised rubrics more clearly articulate the alignment between assessments and student demonstration of connections between theory and practice, including

appropriate uses of technology. 2015-16 plans include ongoing ECE Comprehensive Exam prompt and rubric revisions.

- Goal B: A new Dispositions and Ethics Activity was developed and piloted to provide data for Goals B, C, and D. This new assessment focuses on application of the NAEYC Professional Code of Ethics for the ECE field, including reflections on advocacy, relationship building with families, and community engagement. This new assessment will be refined in 2015-16.

- Goal C: The Charter School Project and rubric were revised and realigned to the NAEYC standards and key elements. The revised assessment and rubric will be piloted and refined in 2015-16.

- Goal D: Assessments and rubrics for the Field Portfolio and the Leadership Activity were revised and realigned with the NAEYC standards and key elements. The revised assessment and rubric will be piloted and refined in 2015-16.

In addition the data collection system was reexamined and revised. A new, shared database was established to give faculty members access and flexibility in documenting their respective assessment scores. New procedures for documenting and analyzing data each semester were negotiated and agreed upon.

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

Six assessments will be used to evaluate student performance relative to the four goals:
- Assessment 1: Project/Thesis or Comprehensive Exam will evaluate Goal A
- Assessment 2: Field Portfolio will evaluate Goals A, B, C, and D
- Assessment 3: Charter School Project will evaluate Goals A and C
- Assessment 4: Leadership Activity will evaluate Goal D
- Assessment 5: Action Research Activity will evaluate Goal A
- Assessment 6: Dispositions and Ethics Activity will evaluate Goals B, C, and D

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

Our program participated in an accreditation review process in which it was evaluated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) during the 2013-14 school year. This review indicated that all standards, which are aligned with our SOAP outcomes, were met but some of the standards were met provisionally with conditions. As part of the second review process, our program undertook revisions for all signature assessments and rubrics. We will continue to engage in the work if continuous program improvement, based on our SOAP and NAEYC standards, to

identify areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions. This process supports us in sustaining a program of high quality.