

4.3.c Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning

All credential programs conduct assessments on candidates' diversity proficiencies through a variety of instruments: course work requirements specific to diversity proficiencies, assessment of professional disposition on diversity, standardized instruments or surveys (candidates and/or employers) that include the component of diversity proficiencies. Successful completion of all course work in programs with embedded assessment of diversity proficiencies is one crucial indicator of candidates' meeting diversity proficiencies. Aggregate data are also generated from assessment instruments that assess diversity proficiencies among other proficiencies to provide feedback on how candidates as a whole perform. Description of assessment instruments of programs and their corresponding data is confined to components pertaining to diversity proficiencies. Complete reports on all assessment instruments and their data are available in the biennial reports of these programs.

Multiple Subject

Assessment Instruments:

The program uses multiple assessment instruments to assess candidates including the following:

- Chancellor's Survey: (CTQ Evaluations)
- Exit Evaluations
- Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs): FAST: Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers
- Other Sources: Faculty Input: Multiple Subject Program Review Committee

Data Results

Aggregate data from CTQ Evaluations illustrate the student outcome on diversity proficiency of this program.

Resources for At-Risk Students:

Goals and Results:

- By 2016, the CTQ score for knowledge about resources for at risk will rise to 85 %.
(Supervisors: 85% in '09-'10) **GOAL MET**
- By 2010, 95% of candidates will be able to list/identify at risk populations and services as evidenced through a Differentiated Instruction and Classroom Management (SPED 179) / Field Study C (EHD 170) assignment or activity with 80% proficiency.
(Completed/Ongoing – through special presentation, exams, and assignments in class)
GOAL MET
- When reviewing the Program Effectiveness Evidence from Job Supervisors this area (“know about resources in the school & community for at-risk students/families”) has met the 85% criteria for success. Our Multiple Subject program faculty (instructors and supervisors) teamed to meet this goal.

Instruction of English Learners:

Goals and Results:

- By 2013, the CTQ score for the EL cluster score will rise to 85%.

When reviewing the “Longitudinal Supervisor Composite D-5.1: School Supervisors Assess CSU Preparation of Teachers to Teach English Learners (K-8),” the data indicates an 88% score as reported by supervisors. The goal was 85% for supervisors. **GOAL MET**

- By 2015, 90% of the teacher candidates will be able to articulate the purpose of the strategy and accommodations as assessed in LEE 172. When reviewing the Teacher Performance Assessment of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST), the data for the Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project indicates a 98% pass rate. **GOAL MET**
The Multiple Subject faculty with expertise in teaching English learners teamed with our Multiple Subject program faculty and supervisors to meet these goals.

Instruction of Students with Special Needs:

Goals and Results:

- By 2014, the CTQ score for the SPED cluster score will rise to 85 %.
(Supervisors: up to 84%) **Large Improvement Made**
- By 2016, the score for item “meet instructional needs in inclusive settings will rise to 85%.”
(Supervisors: 65% in '07-'08; 67%; in 08-09; 80% in 09-10 - strong improvement)
- By 2010, 90% of teacher candidates will be able to develop appropriate accommodations for 2 of 3 identified disabilities with 80% proficiency assessed in SPED 179. (Completed - Assignment changed in SPED 179 and 90% of candidates earned 86% proficiency – This assignment is ongoing) **GOAL MET**
- By 2010, 90% of the teacher candidates will be able to articulate the purpose of the strategy and accommodations selected as assessed in SPED 179. (On-going – Assignment changed in SPED 179 to require students to justify their choice of accommodations and an assignment added to have the students meet and work as a PLC to determine interventions, implement, collect data and share back) **GOAL MET**

Single Subject

Assessment Instruments:

The System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation provides data about student outcome of diversity proficiency of this program in comparison to CSU system averages. Internal Professional Disposition Survey also illustrates candidates' self evaluation of their diversity proficiency.

Data Results:

- The Single Subject Credential Program (1) improved in the area of preparation to teach English learners according to employers and scored above the CSU system average ratings among employers, (2) improved in the area of preparation to teach special learners according to both employers and graduates and scored above the CSU system average ratings by both groups, and (3) improved in the area of preparation to teach at-risk students and scored above the CSU system average among first-year teachers.
- In 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, 362 candidates took the dispositions survey, which includes diversity, rating themselves on a 1-5 scale with reference to various dispositions. The mean score on the entry survey was 4.33. In 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 313 candidates took the exit survey. The mean score on the exit survey was 4.68.

Education Specialist

- The program uses Professional Disposition to assess candidates' levels of valuing diversity. Results are used to facilitate candidates' development of diversity proficiency as individuals. Examples of behavioral indicators include, but are not limited to:
 - 1) Diagnoses learners' needs by interpreting data from diverse sources (e.g., formal/informal assessments, student behavior and feedback, and parent responses)
 - 2) Develops lessons that are interesting and engaging utilizing a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate all learners, including those from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and cultures.
 - 3) Facilitates the academic and social inclusion of students with special needs in various inclusive activities and environments.
 - 4) Differentiates instruction to allow students who differ widely in terms of their background, knowledge, learning styles/preferences, and orientation to school norms to reach common standards.

Assessment Instrument: Aggregate data are also compiled using the Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey which examines the following qualities of candidates:

- 1) Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.
- 2) Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.

Data Results

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey Fall 2008 – Spring 2010 (Mean)

	Competency Statements	Level I		Level II	
		Candidate	Administrator	Candidate	Administrator
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.70	2.75	2.70	2.76
	Means of Competencies in this instrument	2.57	2.68	2.69	2.80

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I): A total of 74 candidates completed the survey between Fall 08 and Spring 10. Level I candidates scored highest in the areas related to adapting and providing effective instruction to diverse learners across settings.

Early Childhood Education

Assessment Instruments

A. Direct Measures

- 1) Assessment of Content Knowledge Summative Assessment: Final Project, Thesis & Research Paper
- 2) Assessment of Content Knowledge: Portfolio
- 3) Assessment of Knowledge, Skills & Dispositions: Combined Charter School
- 4) Assessment of Knowledge, Skills & Dispositions: Leadership Activity
- 5) Assessment of Effects on Student Learning: Action Research Activity
- 6) Assessment of Knowledge, Skills & Dispositions: Professional Ethics

B. Indirect Measures

- 1) Graduate and Employer Survey

Data Results:

Based on the assessment, including anecdotal responses from program faculty, student performance remains strong in

- Ability to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions that promote development and learning;
- Understanding the elements needed to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging for all children;
- Demonstrating their knowledge, accessing resources, and acting as advocates for sound educational practices and policies.

Reading/Language Arts

Assessment Instruments:

A. Direct Measures

- 1) Assessment of Theoretical Comparison Paper
- 2) Assessment of Theory to Practice Project
- 3) Assessment of Case Study Project

B. Indirect measures

- 1) Graduate Student Survey
- 2) Exit Survey

Data Results

Based on the assessment data, including anecdotal responses from program faculty, and graduate students, graduate student performance is strong in: Embed reading instruction and assessment in meaningful contexts

Areas for Improvement include:

- The application of program intervention and universal access was not evident in the writings of the graduate students.

School Social Work

Assessment Instrument: PPS Candidate Dispositions Evaluation – An evaluation tool was developed and utilized to specifically evaluate candidate acquisition of professional dispositions. This data is collected at the end of each semester that candidates are engaged in their PPS field placement. Candidate demonstration of each disposition is rated by the field instructor on a scale of 1-4, with one representing unsatisfactory and four representing above average. A rating of three represents satisfactory and is considered the benchmark for meeting program requirements.

Data Results

2008-09 Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions (n=25)

Disposition	Mean F 08	% Meeting Benchmark	Mean Sp 09	% Meeting Benchmark	Change
Values Diversity	3.76	96%	3.88	96%	+.12

2009-10 Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions (N=23)

Disposition	Mean F 09	% Meeting Benchmark	Mean Sp 10	% Meeting Benchmark	Change
Values Diversity	3.78	100%	3.78	100%	0

Assessment Instrument: PPS Evaluation of Student Performance in Field Placement – A comprehensive evaluation of candidate knowledge and skills is conducted by the MSW/PPS field instructor at the end of the 600 hour PPS field internship. The evaluation addresses professional development, professional values and identity, multi systems practice, and evaluation of practice. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 1-5. In 2009, the scale was applied with one representing excellent, three indicating average, and five being poor. A rating of three is satisfactory and is considered the benchmark for meeting program requirements. In 2010, the scale was reversed to be consistent with all other field and PPS evaluation instruments with five representing excellent and one representing poor. Table 6 depicts the outcome data for candidate performance in field placement for 2009 and 2010. The 2009 mean values were converted for this report to provide consistency with the 2010 data for comparison purposes. While small increments of change are evident in some areas, a t test analysis comparing the 2009 and 2010 cohorts reveals that these differences are not statistically significant.

Data Results

2009 and 2010 Evaluation of Candidate in PPS Field Placement at Program Completion

Skill Area	2009 Mean (Converted)	% Meeting Benchmark	2010 Mean	% Meeting Benchmark	Action Plan Target	Change
Professional Development						
Socio Cultural Competence (#1)	4.56	100%	4.30	100%		-.26
Values and Identity						
Diversity Awareness	4.48	100%	4.17	100%		-.31

Assessment Instrument Exit Surveys:

Unit – An exit survey was developed and implemented by all credential programs in the Unit in spring 2008. The collection of outcome data across the unit was an important addition to the assessment system. PPS candidates in the social work program completed these exit surveys in May.

Data Results

2009 and 2010 Unit Exit Survey (2009, n=16; 2010, n=23)

Area of Preparation	2009 Mean	% Meeting Benchmark	2010 Mean	% Meeting Benchmark	Action Plan Target
Diversity	4.38	100%	4.26	100%	
All can learn	4.63	100%	4.43	100%	

School Counseling

Assessment Instruments:

- 1) "*Clinical Review Protocol*". The protocol includes 9 criteria items that are deemed essential for a successful counselor. These criteria items include: Commitment to improving skills to work with diverse client population. The 9 items are measured using a 5-point scale with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score. The protocol is intended to give feedback on strengths and on areas that the student should consider improving. Failure to "pass" the Clinical Review could indicate unsuitability for this program and for the counseling profession. The Clinical Review Policy is included in our Student Handbook. A passing score is an average of 3.0 on the 5-point scale. The Clinical Review takes place every semester and serves to review the clinical progress of all counseling students who are enrolled in COUN 208, Practicum in Counseling, a required course, during their second or third semester in the program. The Clinical Review Committee reviews each student in COUN 208 at mid-term to evaluate whether the student demonstrates a satisfactory level of competence and qualities to become a counselor.
- 2) "*Assessment of Professional Disposition*" is conducted during practicum (Coun 208) and field placement (Coun 249). One Professional Disposition assessed is Valuing Diversity. Behavioral indicators include, but are not limited to: Diagnose clients' needs by interpreting data from diverse sources (e.g., formal/informal assessments, student behavior and feedback, and parent responses); Develop intervention plans compatible with diverse needs of clients; Accommodates all learners, including those from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and cultures; Respects clients/students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, and interests and is sensitive to community and cultural mores.
- 3) *Employer's Evaluation*: Candidates are rated on a 5-point scale on the following abilities: Ability to counsel with culturally different clients; Ability to counsel with clients of different ages; Ability to counsel with members of the other gender; Ability to utilize effective clinical judgment in the assessment of client needs; Knowledge and understanding of the limitations of tests, including age, cultural and sex differences; Knowledge and understanding of different life styles.

Data Results

Clinical Review:

Fall 2008 + Spring 2009 + Summer 2009 = 121 students were reviewed

Fall 2009 + Spring 2010 + Summer 2010 = 107 students were reviewed

Professional Disposition:

1st Evaluation: COUN 208 Instructor

Fall 2008 + Spring 2009 + Summer 2009 = 121 evaluations

Fall 2009 + Spring 2010 + Summer 2010 = 107 evaluations

Total = 228 evaluations

2nd Evaluation: COUN 249 On-Site Supervisor

Fall 2008 + Spring 2009 + Summer 2009 = 113 evaluations
Fall 2009 + Spring 2010 + Summer 2010 = 94 evaluations
Total = 207 evaluations

Employer's Evaluation:

Fall 2008 + Spring 2009 + Summer 2009 = 113 evaluations
Fall 2009 + Spring 2010 + Summer 2010 = 94 evaluations
Total = 207 evaluations

Data indicated that all students scored “satisfactory” or above on the scoring rubrics for each of these instruments.

School Psychologist

Assessment Instrument: Kremen School of Education Exit Survey

This survey was designed by an interprofessional team and is used as part of our NCATE review process. Students graduating from credential programs (e.g., teaching, including special education, nursing, counseling, social work) are asked to fill out this survey. The data reported are mean ratings by school psych students.

Data Results

Items	2009	2010
I am prepared to use techniques to build rapport with students	5.00	4.83
I am prepared to respond with fairness to disabled, ethnically, and linguistically diverse students	5.00	4.83
My preparation has upheld the concept that all individuals can learn	5.00	4.83
5=Excellent preparation, 4=More than adequate preparation, 3=adequate preparation, 2 = Less than adequate preparation, 1 = Very inadequate preparation, 0 = Not applicable	N=7	N=6

Assessment Instrument: Faculty Ratings

Each student in the program is rated by the school psychology faculty independently each semester. Characteristics on the evaluation form were selected to reflect professional competencies necessary for independent practice as a school psychologist. Ratings are on a scale from 1 to 5. Summary data are presented below for the total evaluation; aggregated data indicate high ratings across all items and cohorts.

Data Results

	08-09 Total N = 27	09-10 Total N = 30
COMMUNICATION SKILLS (Written and oral, presentations, diplomatic in stating problems & presenting information, sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity)	4.49	4.70

Please rate the student according to the following scale:

5=excellent, 4=good, 3=average, 2=needs improvement, 1= unacceptable, NA= not applicable

Assessment Instrument: Portfolio

Candidates in the School Psychology Program at California State University Fresno are required to submit a portfolio in order to ensure they have mastered all program goals and objectives. The contents of the portfolio include samples of work that have been completed during each year of the program. Individual items, such as reports, are graded during the class for which they were assigned. Portfolio contents are designed to demonstrate competence based on NASP and CCTC training standards.

The portfolio is submitted prior to finals at the end of each year to the Program Coordinator, who distributes the portfolios to the School Psychology Program faculty for evaluation. The portfolio is cumulative; students are expected to add to the portfolio as they progress through the program, and that each year the portfolio should become more comprehensive.

Portfolio Contents include Indicator 5: Diversity in Development and Learning

Data Results: *Summary of Portfolio Data for 2009-2010*

	YR 1 % Complete	YR 2% Complete	YR 3 % Complete
2009	37%	29%	93%
2010	17%	68%	99%

Note: Each indicator is rated as:

0 = Not Present (No components are included in the student's portfolio)

1 = Partial (Some, but not all of the components are contained within the student's portfolio)

2 = Complete (All components are contained within the student's portfolio)

Agricultural Specialist

Assessment Instrument Agriculture Specialist Graduate Employer Follow-up Survey Spring 2006: Preparation Scale

The purpose of this scale was to measure administrators' perceptions of the level of preparation possessed by "New Teachers" from the Agriculture Teacher Preparation Program at California State University, Fresno. Based on the administrators experience and evaluation of their recently hired (1-5 years) teacher they were asked to indicate the level of preparation they possess in the following categories by selecting the appropriate number using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Not Prepared to 5 = Well Prepared.

Data Results:

Administrators' perceptions of new teachers' level of preparedness.

Agriculture Specialist Competency	N	Mean	SD
Working effectively with the local community	17	4	1.06
Working with students of diverse cultures	18	3.72	1.13

Assessment Instrument: Professional Competency Scale

The purpose of this scale was to measure the effectiveness of the Agricultural Education coursework in preparing graduates to teach and perform the responsibilities of an agriculture teacher. Based on the Agricultural Education courses completed at Fresno State, participants indicate their perceived level of preparation to perform or teach by selecting the appropriate number using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Not Prepared to 5 = Well Prepared.

Data Results

Agriculture Specialist Competency	N	Mean	SD
Working effectively with the local community	32	3.63	1.10
Working with students of diverse cultures	32	3.59	1.10

Deaf Education

Assessment Instrument Employer Surveys

Also as a part of the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan, employer surveys are sent out once during each five year cycle of the assessment plan. Surveys were distributed and responses compiled. A total of 19 employer responses were received. The average employers rating was 3.98 (range 3.3 - 4.0). Employers indicated that alumni were well prepared in all areas surveyed, by rating all areas as “good” or “excellent”, as seen in the table below.

Data Results

Areas Being Assessed	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Average Points
Skill in treatment; the ability to develop treatment plans appropriate to a client’s or student’s needs	95%	5%	0	0	3.95
Adequate knowledge of specific characteristics of the population served	85%	15%	0	0	3.84
Ability to communicate with families	74%	26%	0	0	3.73
Ability to communicate with clients or students	85%	15%	0	0	3.84

School Nursing Services

Assessment Instrument: Preceptor Checklist of Skills and Competencies

This tool is used to assess competencies and mentor the candidate throughout practicum experience. The preceptor meets with the candidate before the end of the semester to discuss accomplishments, strengths and areas of need. The preceptor completes and signs the evaluation form and submitted it to clinical instructor at the end of the semester before a final grade can be issued to the candidate.

Data Results

* School Nurse Competencies 3, Professional Management Skills											
Taking all practicum activities into consideration, rate the total performance of this candidate using the following scale.											
Key: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Very good; 3 = Good; 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor											
		Elementary					Secondary				
NURS 186, Practicum I (Elementary) and NURS 187 (Secondary)		Fall 2009					Spring 2010				
Number of candidates		36 Total					36 Total				
		5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1	Demonstrates leadership and the ability to use professional knowledge, skills, and ethical decision making to promote the overall health of the school community and of individuals.	34 94%	2 6%	0	0	0	35 97%	1 3%	0	0	0
2	Describes a realistic plan for organizing and implementing an overall school health program that considers uniqueness of population and cultural differences.	32 88%	4 12%	0	0	0	35 97%	1 3%	0	0	0
5	Demonstrates the ability to advocate appropriately with students, families, community, and others to promote healthy behaviors and lifestyles.	35 97%	1 3%	0	0	0	35 97%	1 3%	0	0	0

Assessment Instrument: Preceptor Evaluation of Candidate Professional Dispositions

School site preceptors observe for these traits in candidates during clinical practice. At the end of the semester, preceptors meet with candidates to discuss these dispositions and to complete and sign the evaluation form, which is submitted to the clinical instructor.

Data Results

Key: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Very good; 3 = Good; 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor																					
		32 responders					30 responders					31 respondents					30 responses				
Candidate Dispositions demonstrated		NURS 186 - F 2008					NURS 186 - F 2009					NURS 187 - S 2009					NURS 187 - S 2010				
		5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4	Tendency to VALUE DIVERSITY	28 88%	4 13%	0	0	0	28 93%	2 7%	0	0	0	29 94%	2 6%	0	0	0	28 93%	2 7%	0	0	0

Speech-Language Pathology

Assessment Instrument: SLPS Candidate Dispositions – An existing clinical practicum evaluation tool is utilized to evaluate each candidate’s acquisition of professional dispositions. This data was collected during the Fall 2008-Spring 2010 semesters for candidates enrolled in their SLPS educational field placement. Candidate demonstration of each disposition was rated by the field instructor on a scale of 1-5, with “1” representing *inadequate* and “5” representing *excellent*. A rating of “4” represents *good* and is considered to be the benchmark for meeting program requirements.

Data Result:

Table 1: 2008-2010 Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions at Program Completion

Rating Scale: N/A= Not Applicable/Not addressed yet

- 1 = Needs 100% Assistance/Feedback: Inadequate (Inability to make changes).
- 2 = Needs 75% Assistance/Feedback: Nominal (regularly needs specific direction/demonstration).
- 3 = Needs 50% Assistance/Feedback: Adequate (often needs some general direction/demonstration).
- 4 = Needs 25% Assistance/Feedback: Good (needs occasional direction/demonstration).
- 5 = Independent with Minimal Assistance/Feedback: Excellent (takes initiative and performs effectively)

Candidate Disposition	Mean (1-5) Fall 2008	Mean (1-5) Spring 2009	Mean (1-5) Fall 2009	Mean (1-5) Spring 2010	% Meeting Benchmark
Values Diversity	4.95	4.6	4.6	4.8	94%

Masters in Teaching

Assessment Instruments:

- 1) Critically reflective assignments and posts, problem-based papers, and mixed methods research modules in CI240 and ERA243 (Cohort 7, fall) and critically reflective case studies, problem-based video critiques and production, and action research critiques and projects in CI246, CI260 and CI298 (Cohort 6, fall).
- 2) Critically reflective assignments and posts, case study and video critiques, and action research critiques in CI241 and action research mini-study in CI245 (Cohort 7, spring) and critically reflective case studies, problem-based video critiques and production, and action research critiques and projects in CI246, CI260 and CI298 (Cohort 6, fall).
- 3) Critically reflective assignments and posts, case study and video critiques, and action research critiques in CI240, CI241, and action research mini-study in CI245 (Cohort 7, spring) and critically reflective case studies, problem-based video critiques and production, and action research critiques and projects in CI246, CI260 and CI298 (Cohort 6, fall).

Data Results

Nearly all students scored “exemplary” on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements.

Educational Administration

Assessment Instrument Signature Assignments

The Signature Assignments have a continuum or rubric scores that align with the assessed student learning outcome. The philosophy of the faculty centers on the importance of every candidate evidencing learning at an Acceptable or Target level, therefore, first time great lesson planning, design, and delivery is a priority. Based on the Signature Assignment score, if a candidate does not evidence learning at an Acceptable or Target level (earned a score of Does Not Meet Expectation - major revision needed or Progressing – minor revision needed), the candidate is expected to revise his/her work to meet expectation of the intended learning, and resubmit the work. Instructors re-teach and/or coach-up the candidate as needed. Candidates may also revise work to evidence and move learning from an Acceptable to Target level. The continuum (rubric) scores from six different Signature Assignments were used to measure this learning outcome.

Data Results

Assignment results represent four different courses (EAD 262, EAD 272, EAD 274, and EAD 269) during this academic year (Fall 2011 and Spring 2012).

Signature Assignment and Embedded Fieldwork Rubric Scores Measuring Student Learning Objective: Knowledge and Skills to Implement Equitable Practices

Assignment (Course)	Did Not Meet Expectation		Progressing: Slightly Below Expectation		Acceptable: Meets Expectation		Target		Revised and Resubmitted	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reform Plan (262)	0	0	0	0	5	5	91	95	13	14
Unwrapping Standards (272)	0	0	5	7	4	5	66	88	25	33
Instructional Strategies (272)	1	1	0	0	5	7	69	92	22	29
Instructional Rounds (272)	0	0	1	1	7	10	67	89	15	20
Equity Audit (274)	0	0	0	0	8	20	33	80	15	37
Current State/Desired Future (269)	0	0	0	0	26	51	25	49	3	6

Assessment Instrument: End-of- Program Survey

Data Results

Graduating Candidates' Responses for End-of-Program Survey: Item Mean Score Comparisons for 2008, 2010, and 2012

Question #/Description	2008* Average	2010 Average	2012 Average
8e Program help recognize importance of diversity	4.0	4.5	4.7
N	47	69	49

Note. 1-5 scale

***including CF5 2007 data**