

CSU FRESNO ACCREDITATION CYCLE

California Accreditation Cycle

Year	Date of Year	Key Activity
	2006-2007	Data Collection Only
1	2007-2008	Biennial Report
2	2008-2009	Data Collection Only
3	2009-2010	Biennial Report
4	2010-2011	Resubmit Program Documents
5	2011-2012	Biennial Report
6	2012-2013	Resubmit Common Standards – SITE VISIT
7	2013-2014	Respond to issues raised in the site visit

BIENNIAL REPORT

Section A - Each Program develops (10 pages each) SEE BELOW

Section B - Unit/Institution - Summary and Plan of Action

SECTION A

(This report does not have to be narrative – please use charts, tables, lists...)

1. **TEMPLATE (1 PG)**

2. **CANDIDATE/ASSESSMENT (Pgs. ?? 4-5)**
 They suggest that this is 6-8 assessments that are described and implemented
 Descriptive statistics of candidate performance (competence and deficiencies) and program effectiveness

3. **ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATE DATA (Pgs. 1-3)**
 Candidate and program strengths and areas for improvement

4. **USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS (Pgs. 1-2)**
 List program's modifications and how they will affect the program.
PLAN OF ACTION
 Improve Candidate Performance
 Improve Program Performance

DUE 9/15/08

02/04

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-1
Contextual Information

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

California State University, Fresno is one of 23 universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. Fresno State’s last joint visit (NCATE/CCTC) was in March 2006. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs.

The M.A. in Education (Curriculum and Instruction Option) degree program is designed to provide professional and specialized preparation for the candidate interested in acquiring knowledge and skills essential for the design and development of curriculum and related instructional practices. Although the program does not require applicants to hold a teaching credential, over 80% of applicants are classroom teachers in grades PreK-12. The program is unique in that candidates can personalize the program with at least 14 units of electives from one or more areas of desired specialization (including areas such as mathematics and business outside the School of Education. This flexibility and personalization is attractive to individuals from a variety of areas. This diversity creates both great opportunities for students and great challenges in advising/scheduling for the Program Coordinator, who serves as program advisor for all of the students in the program. Students entering the program during the same semester have unique course trajectories (core courses, instructors, electives), and students can take from 1.5 to 5 years to complete the program. Hence, tracking a particular "group" of C&I students (as well as scheduling courses) is challenging.

All students in the program take the following core courses: CI 250 (Advanced Curriculum Theory and Analysis), CI 275 (Advanced Instructional Theories and Strategies), CI 285 (Seminar in Advanced Educational Psychology or ERA 288 (Educational Measurement and Program Evaluation), ERA 220 (Research in Education), and CI 298 (Project) or CI 299 (Thesis).

During the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years, the C&I program was in a period of transition (new program coordinator), stabilization/organization (development of a database/communication system to track and regularly advise/mentor all C&I students in order to improve student retention and student perception of program success/satisfaction), and expansion (active recruitment of strong students through Provost's scholarships, communication with partnership districts about new opportunities for cohort development).

Curriculum & Instruction Program Candidate Information		
Year	Number of Candidates Admitted <small>(100% of applicants)</small>	Number of Completers/Graduates <small>(not a subset of those admitted that year)</small>
2006-2007	16	11 (8 females, 3 males; 4 Hispanic, 1 Asian)
2007-2008	23	15 (13 females, 2 males; 1 Asian, 3 Hispanic)
Fall 2008	63	N/A
Total	102	26 (81% female; 27% Hispanic, 8% Asian)

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
• ERA 153 allowed as part of electives; up to 9 units of postbaccalaureate credential allowed as part of electives	2005-2006
• New Program Coordinator	May 2006
• New Blackboard Organization to Support C&I Graduate Students and Faculty was Established.	Fall 2006
• C&I Student Database for Course Tracking and Regular Communication/Advising was Developed and Updated.	2006 (ongoing)
• Wrote proposals to fund Provost's Graduate Scholarships	2006-2007
• New Student Orientation Initiated and Held Each Semester	2007 (ongoing)
• Recognition of C&I Graduates with 3.9 and 4.0 GPAs: Provided Honor Cords to Wear During the Graduate Hooding Ceremony	2007 (ongoing)
• Focus on Recruitment of District-based Cohorts	2007-2008
• Revised Exit Surveys	Fall 2008
• Revised Employer Surveys	Fall 2008
• Revised Alumni Surveys	Fall 2008

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-2
Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

A. Candidate Assessments the program uses to and through recommending degree

List 4-6 Key Assessments (not admissions data)

1. Program Decision Points Data
2. Graduate Writing Requirement
3. Analysis of Classroom Teaching
4. Project/Thesis

Summary of Data

1. Program Decision Points Data -- The table below summarizes decision points data for the C&I program. In it, we track the number of students admitted in 2006-2007 and in 2007-2008 with regard to whether they have passed the graduate writing requirement, advanced to candidacy, completed their project/thesis, and have graduated during the two years this report covers, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. We find that of the 16 students admitted during the 2006-2007 academic year, all passed the graduate writing requirement, and 15 have advanced to candidacy. So far, 11 have completed their project and graduated. Of the 23 admitted in the 2007-2008 year, 39% have passed the graduate writing requirement and 8.7% have been advanced to candidacy so far. We plan to keep tracking the progress of our students from matriculation to graduation.

**Curriculum & Instruction Program Candidate Information
for Students Still in Program as of Summer 2008 (Progress Chart)**

Year Admitted	Admitted	Passed Graduate Writing Requirement	Advanced	Project Completed 06-07, 07-08	Graduated during 2006-07, 2007-08
Before 2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	11, 4	11, 4 (Total: 15)
2006-2007	16	16	15	0, 11	0, 11 (Total: 11)
2007-2008	23	9	2	0, 0	0, 0
Fall 2008	63	0	0	0, 0	0, 0

2. Graduate Writing Requirement -- As one of the requirements for CI 250, each student identifies a current issue of interest concerning curriculum or instruction, locates and reads

related literature, and writes a scholarly paper 8-10 pages in length reviewing the literature and drawing conclusions about the issue. The student's writing must demonstrate:

- comprehensibility;
- clear organization and presentation of ideas;
- an ability to arrange ideas logically so as to establish a sound scholarly argument;
- thoroughness and competence in documentation;
- an ability to express in writing a critical analysis of existing scholarly/professional literature in the student's area of interest; and
- an ability to model the discipline's overall style as reflected in representative journals.

A Scoring Rubric has been developed to provide guidance to both students and faculty. The student receives a score on each of following three sub-scales: Style and Format, Mechanics, and Content and Organization. Scores range from 1 to 4 with the following designations:

- 4 - Exemplary
- 3 - Accomplished
- 2 - Developing
- 1 - Beginning

In order to demonstrate writing proficiency, the student must receive a score of "3" in each area. The instructor of CI 250 is the primary evaluator of each student's writing. When the instructor determines that the student meets the criteria (achieves a score of 3 in each area of the rubric), the process is considered completed. If the instructor believes the student's writing to be deficient in one or more areas, the paper is referred to the Review Committee and is evaluated by the committee as a whole. The Review Committee consists of 2 graduate faculty in addition to the instructor. If the committee determines that the student meets the criteria, the process is considered completed and the chair of the committee would notify the Program Coordinator that the student has demonstrated writing proficiency.

If the reviewers determine that the student has not demonstrated competence in written English, the student would be required to remediate writing skills. The appropriate methods for remediation is determined in conjunction with the Review Committee and monitored by the student's Graduate Advisor. Following remediation, the student would submit a letter to the Graduate Advisor outlining the steps taken to improve writing proficiency and requesting that he or she be allowed to redo the writing assessment. With the concurrence of the advisor, the student would be allowed to redo the writing assignment on a different topic. The new writing sample would be evaluated by the Review Committee and the decision of the committee considered final.

A student may pass CI 250 but fail the graduate writing assessment. This assessment must be passed before the student is allowed to advance to candidacy. So far, all C&I students who entered in 2006-2007 have passed the graduate writing requirement, and 9 of the 23 who entered in 07-08 have passed the requirement; this number is relatively low because many of the students will enroll in CI 250 in Fall 2008.

3. Analysis of Classroom Teaching -- One of the required assignments in CI 275 is Analyzing Classroom Teaching. There are two goals for this assignment. The first is to help students understand how to successfully implement effective instructional strategies when working with

students from diverse populations. The second is to give them practice in systematically recording classroom observations so they can be used for reflective thinking and decision-making.

This assignment requires students to:

- Choose a dimension of instruction they would like to improve in their own teaching (or someone else's if they are not teaching);
- Select a feature to analyze in the lesson (e.g., questioning techniques, group interaction, teacher response to misbehavior);
- Develop a method/procedure/instrument for collecting data;
- Videotape at least one lesson taught to a small group or whole class;
- Collect and analyze data collected during the lesson(s) based on the area of instruction selected; and
- Set goals for teaching based on what was discovered.

The assignment is scored in the following categories: Rationale, Overview of lesson, Method of data collection, Analysis, Results, Conclusions, and Goals. A 4-point scoring rubric is used for assessing the assignment. The charts below summarize the scores of each of the students in the two sections of CI 275 taught in Spring 2007 and Spring 2008. The scores are broken down by the seven categories above.

CI 275 Spring 2007

Student	Rationale	Overview of Lesson	Method of Data Collection	Analysis	Results	Concl.	Goals	Total
1	4	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.71
2	3.5	4	4	3	4	3	4	3.64
3	4	4	4	3.5	4	4	4	3.93
4	4	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	4	3.79
5	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.50
6	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
7	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.79
8	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3.43
9	3	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3.57
10	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	4	3.86
11	3	3.5	3	3.5	3.5	3	4	3.36
12	4	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.5	3.79
13	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3.5	3.71
14	4	4	4	3.5	4	3.5	4	3.86
15	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	4	3.86
16	3	3	3.5	3	4	3	3.5	3.29
17	4	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.79
18	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	4	3.79
19	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
20	3.5	3	3.5	3	4	3.5	3.5	3.43
21	4	4	3.5	4	3.5	4	4	3.86
22	4	4	4	3.5	4	4	4	3.93
23	4	3.5	4	3	3.5	4	4	3.71
24	3.5	3.5	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.57
Averages	3.67	3.63	3.71	3.6	3.79	3.73	3.88	3.71

CI 275 Spring 2008

Student	Rationale	Overview of Lesson	Method of Data Collection	Analysis	Results	Concl.	Goals	Total
1	Inc.							
2	3	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3.64
3	4	4	3.5	4	4	4	4	3.93
4	4	4	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.71
5	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.50
6	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
7	3.5	3	3.5	4	4	3.5	4	3.64
8	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3	3.21
9	4	4	4	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	3.79
10	Inc.							
11	4	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.79
12	4	4	4	3	4	3.5	4	3.79
13	3.5	4	3	4	3	3	2.5	3.29
14	4	3	4	3.5	4	4	4	3.79
15	3	4	3.5	3	4	3	3	3.36
16	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	3.64
17	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
18	4	3.5	3.5	4	3.5	4	4	3.79
19	4	3.5	3.5	3	3.5	4	4	3.64
20	4	4	3.5	4	4	4	4	3.93
Averages:	3.72	3.69	3.53	3.67	3.75	3.75	3.72	3.69

4. Project/Thesis – During the period covered by this review, no student completed a thesis; a project is overwhelmingly viewed as the preferred culminating experience by C&I students. The program plans to encourage more students to write a thesis. During the period of time covered by this review, 26 students successfully completed a master's project. One of the goals this coming year (2008-2009) is to develop more detailed guidelines for the project, as well as a rubric that can be used to assess projects.

B. Addition information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness

List additional tools used

1. Exit Survey -- Currently students receive the Division of Graduate Studies' exit survey, but results of this survey are delayed by as much as a year, so one of the goals this semester is to develop a survey that will be administered to students during the semester in which they are enrolled in CI 298 or CI 299.

During 2006-2007, the MA in Education program was reviewed (5-year review). Several C&I students participated in a focus group meeting with the evaluators, who expressed that we should videotape these students to promote the C&I program, as they were quite passionately positive about all aspects of their graduate experience and the faculty members with whom they had worked.

Each semester during 2006-2008, the Program Coordinator contacted all students in the program to assess their progress. Particular attention was given to the four students who entered during 2007-2008 and did not finish the program. Each dropped out during the first semester: one who had a pace maker dropped due to high levels of stress associated with a particular instructor, two for financial difficulties, and one because she failed CI 250.

2. Alumni Survey -- A formal alumni survey has not been conducted recently; one of the goals of 2008-2009 is to develop and administer such a survey.

3. Employer Survey -- A formal employer survey has also not been conducted recently; another of the goals of 2008-2009 is to develop and administer an employer survey.

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-3
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IN SECTION A-2

The section above contains charts and commentary regarding the primary candidate assessments used by the C&I program. In addition, in 2007, students in the C&I program received Provost's Graduate Scholarships and Graduate Student Research Merit Awards. (Advisees of the C&I Program Coordinator were the only KSOEHD students to be recognized that year as recipients of these awards.) Faculty will be urged to continue supporting students in applying for the GSRMA. The documentation of "changes since Commission approval of current program document" above provides evidence of considerable growth in and accomplishments by the C&I program and its students since 2006. The Program's 5-year review in 2007 was highly complimentary of the program based on student focus group interviews.

Analyzing Classroom Teaching (ACT) Assignment: The instructor for CI 275 was asked to reflect on this assignment:

"Overall, I have been pleased with the results of the Analyzing Classroom Teaching (ACT) Assignment. The assignment has been beneficial to CI 275 students, primarily as a tool to analyze and improve their own teaching and subsequently as a scaffold to their Master's Project/Thesis. The experience of developing a study of this nature is challenging for student, as many have never undertaken an assignment with this level of rigor. The process previous faculty have taken in developing and refining the assignment was extremely helpful, particularly the checkpoints. The checkpoints are an excellent place to monitor the progress of each of the students and serve as a springboard to complete the total assignment. Typically, a quality checkpoint #1 resulted in a quality ACT.

"There have been challenges: initially (Spring 2007) my own lack of experience and reference point with the assignment was a detriment in trying to explain the assignment. I didn't have a sample assignment to reference both for myself and the students. Although you don't want to stifle creativity in student work, you definitely need to clearly spell out the expectations. The rubric does this quite well. Another challenge I have experienced both semesters was the graduate student who is not actually teaching in the classroom. I handled this by asking those students to pair up with a student who had access to a classroom. This resulted in an unintended positive consequence as two people analyzing the teaching act gave the report more depth. It is one thing to analyze yourself and quite another to have someone else provide feedback.

"Predictably, the second time I taught the course (Spring 2008), I felt that I more effectively explained and monitored the assignment. I also broadened the possible topics/areas for students

to select by incorporating the Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA) Program that was generated from Good and Brophy's work with Teacher Expectations. The program topics are outlined in such a way that you can clearly focus on a particular area that impacts student achievement and analyze your effectiveness in that area. TESA provides a brief overview in different areas such as Equitable Opportunity of Response, Praise, Proximity, Latency/Wait time, Higher Level Questioning, etc."

Graduate Writing Requirement -- Although some students require more than one submission of their paper in order to pass this requirement, almost 100% of the C&I students eventually pass this requirement. Those who have passed the requirement in the past 2 years and who have gone on to write a project have been successful in doing so.

Project/Thesis -- C&I has historically produced award-winning theses, but in the past two years no student has elected to write a thesis and successfully complete it. This will be an area that the C&I faculty will need to discuss and determine a plan to encourage and support more theses. Clear expectations of thesis and project advisors need to be established. The program also needs to evaluate current expectations for projects and to develop more specific guidelines to give to students and professors.

New Exit, Alumni, and Employer surveys will be developed and piloted during 2008-2009.

**California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-4**

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

Specific Objective	Strategies/Tasks	Person(s) Responsible	Date
<i>Update and revise the C&I Program SOAP</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold regular meetings to review and revise the SOAP to reflect candidate dispositions and review/update program goals and student learning outcomes. - Review content of courses and align with the program goals and student learning outcomes. 	Program Coordinator and program faculty	By Spring 2009
<i>Develop new assessments of student learning outcomes.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C&I faculty meet to develop a new Exit Survey, Employer Survey, and Alumni Survey that align with program goals and objectives. - The new assessments will be administered and the results included in the next report. 	Program Coordinator and program faculty	By Spring 2009
<i>Revisit the Analyzing Classroom Teaching (ACT) assignment in CI 275.</i>	The ACT assignment will be reviewed to determine if it is still serving its purpose or needs to be modified.	CI 275 instructor(s), Program Coordinator, and other program faculty	By Spring 2009
<i>Revise and expand guidelines for the Project.</i>	C&I graduate faculty will review current project guidelines and develop more detailed guidelines and expectations that will be shared with faculty and students. Development of a scoring rubric will be explored.	Program Coordinator and program faculty	By Spring 2009
<i>Explore resurrecting the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology.</i>	Assess student interest in earning this certificate and the demand for educational technology electives. If level of interest warrants offering Educational Technology courses, begin doing so. Update existing courses and investigate offering newly designed courses.	Coordinator of the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology and other C&I program faculty	By Spring 2010