FRESNO STATE

Discovery. Diversity. Distinction.

Kremen School of Education and Human Development

Program Assessment Reports
2016-2017

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

Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)
Dr. Nancy Akhavan, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

The overarching goal of the online Master of Arts in Teaching is to prepare candidates to become inclusive teachers and critically reflective, equity-oriented educators who are familiar with multiple ways of framing issues and concerns related to teaching, skilled in using action research to inform and improve their own practice, and strong in communicating with a wide variety of constituencies, including those who speak a language other than English. Consequently, the program contributes directly to the needs of our democratic schools and society. Consistent with the mission and vision of CSU Fresno and KSOEHD, the online MAT assessed, reflected upon and revised actions regarding a set of learning outcomes, which were delineated below in fall 2012. The program's core courses as well as assessment components have been **re**-constructed around these **new** seven learning outcomes.

Specific Learning Outcomes assessed during 2015/16 for both Cohort 11 (who began the program fall 2014 and graduated fall 2015) and Cohort 12 (who began the program fall 2016 and will graduate this fall 2017) are identified below with an asterisk (*). Each learning outcome section concludes by succinctly identifying the instruments used, findings with respect to learning outcomes assessed, and changes made in the program based on these data. In short, this Annual Assessment Report on the online MAT integrates the first five questions from the assessment guidelines/template, namely:

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

Before beginning the 2016/2017 Annual Report, a few caveats are in order: First, the new MAT coordinator is Dr. Nancy Akhavan (ERE 243) began her prominent role during summer 2017. Dr. Akhavan has extensive background in online education and received a QOLT (Quality Online Learning and Teaching) Award from TILT/CSALT during their review process of ERE 243 with MAT Cohort 10 spring, 2015. MAT Coordinator, Dr. Walter J. Ullrich (CI 260), also received a QOLT Award for CI 260 fall, 2014 for his work with MAT Cohort 9. Second, all MAT Cohort 11 passed their Comprehensive Examination fall 2016, consistent with reaching the Mastery level on all 7 learning outcomes identified below. Finally, and perhaps most important, the online MAT was rated as the #14 best online master's degree program in the US by BestColleges.com http://www.bestcolleges.com/features/best-online-masters-education-programs/ *(1) Critical Questioner (CQ)**: CI240 (Fall, 2016), **ENTRY LEVEL**; CI241, (Spring, 2017)

INTERMEDIATE LEVEL; CI 246 (Fall, 2016), CI 260 (Fall, 2016), **MASTERY**
Students will express a critical, questioning perspective (i.e., identify, describe, and analyze) about diverse theoretical paradigms about teaching, learning and school reform, including those

generated by marginalized groups, which situate schooling in a larger historic and political context.

This means that:

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

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

1. CI 240 was refined summer 2016 by a veteran faculty Dr. Melanie Wenrick to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was refined by Dr. Walter J. Ullrich before spring 2017 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246 and CI 260 were refined summer 2016 by veteran faculty Dr. Chris Foster and Dr. Walter Ullrich respectively to help students reach this outcome at the Mastery level. These courses will be up for review again in summer 2018
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included problem-based case studies "resolved" on Group Discussion Boards (GDB) and VoiceThread (VT); problem-based video critiques on GDB and VT, and critically reflective Assignments in CI 240 and CI 241, research papers, digital productions in CI 246 and CI 260, and a Comprehensive Examination in CI 260.
3. Data/Results in CI 240, CI 241, CI 246, and CI 260, indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements.
4. These data were used summer 2017 to refine CI260 and CI246 to continue to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their Culminating Examination.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, the NCATE visit spring 2014, and more specifically the data collected above, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller (faculty responsible for the foundations/curriculum/instruction strand in the MAT) refined CI240 summer 2016 for her fall 2016 offering. This information was shared with the new lecturer teaching the course in fall 2017, Dr. Adrianna Cervantes Gonzalez. Dr. Cervantes Gonzalez joins the program faculty as a leader in social justice. Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2017 for their fall 2017 offerings.

*(2) Scholar Activist (SA): ERE 243 (Fall, 2015), **ENTRY**; CI 245 (Spring, 2016), **INTERMEDIATE;** CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015) CI 298B Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**
Students will search, navigate, and critically consume (read, analyze, and use) educational research. This means that:

- Students use electronic search processes to locate appropriate resources.
- Students show familiarity with a range of important journals, including research journals.
- Students evaluate the appropriateness of different research methods for the particular question being asked and research design.
- Students describe how different research designs broaden or narrow both the questions and the findings.
- Students can critique epistemological assumptions of multiple research paradigms.
- Students can read, evaluate, and use articles that report both quantitative and qualitative

research.

The SA learning outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:
1. ERE 243 was refined summer 2016 and assessed fall 2016 by Dr. Nancy Akhavan to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 was re- designed before spring 2017 by new faculty Dr. David Low, and Dr. Nancy Akhavn to continue to assist students in reaching this outcome at the Intermediate level (I); CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.
2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Zoom, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in ERE 243, CI245, CI 246, CI 260, and CI 298B indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements. Most significantly, 20% of the MAT Cohort 11 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience, as fine a testament to Dr. Akhavan's and Dr. Low's expertise as any.
4. These data were used summer 2017 to refine ERE 243 and CI 245 for the Entry and Intermediate levels respectively and CI260, CI246, and CI298B to assist students reach the Mastery level for their final semester coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience fall 2017.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past four years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, Dr. Nancy Akhavan and Dr. Low (new faculty responsible for the research strand in the MAT) built on these data to refine ERE 243 for fall 2017, CI 245 for spring 2018. Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI 260 and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2017 once these courses concluded.

*(3) Mixed Methods Action Researcher/Qualitative and Quantitative (MMAR): ERA243 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE;** CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**
Students will use, apply, design, and implement research to bring about change and make improvements in their own professional environment.
This means that:
- Students can describe the main features of action research.
- Students can identify a focused problem related to education, and formally propose a reasonable research process for investigating and acting on that issue
- Students can design and carry out an applied action research study, project or thesis.
- Students can communicate the completed study, project, or thesis both orally and in written or electronic form.
- Students can identify and use the main features of relevant research design.
- Students can reflect on the process of their research and progress toward change as a result of their research.

The MMAR learning outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:
1. ERA243 was redesigned summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) to help students continue to reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI245 was re-designed before spring 2017 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) to continue to assist students reach this outcome at the Mastery level.

2. Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Eluminate, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments,, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in ERA243 and CI245 indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements. As noted above, 20% of the MAT Cohort 11 chose the Action Research Project (CI 298B) for their Culminating Experience.
4. These data were used summer 2016 and again summer 2017 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, Dr. Nancy Akhavan refined ERE 243 summer 2016 and 2017 consistent with these data outlined above while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich (faculty responsible for the foundations/curriculum/ instruction strand, CI260, and design of the Culminating Experiences) and Dr. Chris Foster redesign CI246, CI260, and CI298B summer 2017 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2016.

*(4) Critically Reflective, Equity-Oriented Practitioner (CREQP): CI240 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE;** CI 246 (Fall, 2016), CI 260 (Fall, 2016), CI 298B (Fall, 2016) **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 2016 (and again summer 2017) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI241 was re-designed before spring 2017 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) 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 2016 (and again summer 2017) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller will continue to refine CI240 and CI241 with respect to the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 summer 2017 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2016.

*(5) Clear Communicator (CC): CI 240 (Fall), ERE 243 (Fall) **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE;** CI 246 (Fall, 2016), CI 260 (Fall, 2016), CI 298B (Fall, 2016) **MASTERY**
Students will communicate clearly and effectively orally, in writing, and online and in their action research studies, projects or thesis in a manner that is clear and commands professional attention.
This means that:
- Speaking, writing, and online communication are free of distracting errors.
- Writing and oral communication are organized clearly.
- Forms of communication are appropriate to the topic and audience
- Conventions of using the work of others are employed correctly and ethically.
- Online posts, action research, etc. shows polish and attention to detail.

The CC outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:
1. CI240 and ERE 243 was redesigned summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) 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 2016 (and again summer 2017) 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 ERE 243 and 245 Signature Assignments in Blackboard included mixed methods research modules on Zoom, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in all four of these courses indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement) as well as on the Clear Communicator outcomes identified above.
4. These data were used summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, the Annual Assessment Reports the past five years, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller and Dr. Melanie Wenrick continue to refine CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich

refined CI260 and CI298B and Dr. Chris Foster to build on these data once these courses conclude fall 2016.

*(6) Technological Navigator (TN): CI240 (Fall), ERA243 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring), CI245 (Spring), **INTERMEDIATE;** CI 246 (Fall, 2016), CI 260 (Fall, 2016), CI 298B (Fall, 2016) **MASTERY**
Candidate will use technology critically to access information, to communicate, and as a means of curricular and pedagogical support for higher-level thinking.
This means that:

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

The TN outcome was addressed and assessed in the following ways:
1. CI 240 and ERE 243 were refined summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) to help students reach this outcome at the Entry level (E); CI 241 and CI 245 were refined before spring 2016 to help students reach this outcome at the Intermediate level (I). CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B were refined summer 2016 (and again summer 2017) 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 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 Zoom, Quizzes, Discussion Board, Assignments,, and Five Chapter Outline of Proposed Action Research Mini-Study in ERA243 and Final Action Research Mini-Study in CI245. Signature Assignments in CI 246, CI 260 and CI 298B included research papers, digital productions, and a Comprehensive Examination or an Action Research Project.
3. Data/Results in all four of these courses indicated that nearly all students scored "exemplary" on the scoring rubrics for each of these course and program requirements (e.g., Graduate Writing Requirement). However, the vast majority of the requirements in all four of these courses focused on effective use of technology as a learner, not as a teacher of students.
4. These data were used summer 2016 to re-design CI260, CI246, and CI298B to help students reach the Mastery level in this coursework and their chosen Culminating Experience as teachers using technology with students, not primarily as users of technology as learners.
5. Consistent with the recommendations of the 2011 Self-Study Review Report, the follow- up Self-Study Action Plan, these Annual Assessment Reports, and the NCATE visit spring 2014, new faculty Dr. Elizabeth Miller shared her refinement of to CI240 and CI241 to build on the data in this Annual Report while Dr. Walter J. Ullrich refined CI260 and CI298B and

Dr. Chris Foster refined CI 246 to build on these data once these courses concluded fall 2016.
*(7) Social Justice Collaborator (SJC): CI240 (Fall), **ENTRY**; CI241, (Spring),
INTERMEDIATE; CI 246 (Fall, 2015), CI 260 (Fall, 2015), CI 298B (Fall, 2015) **MASTERY**
Students will work with communities of practice on behalf of social justice. This means that:

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

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

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

What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?
The online MAT program participated in an Accreditation review process under which our program was evaluated by an external body, NCATE, during the 2013-2014 school year. This review and evaluation process included an on-site visit and review of our program from April 6 – 8, 2014. NCATE findings revealed that **all six NCATE standards** were **fully met**, and **no areas for improvement** (AFIs) were indicated. The MAT coordinator and faculty will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas

will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change).

M.A. in Education – Curriculum and Instruction (MAE-C&I)
Dr. Carol Fry Bohlin, Program Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

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

- **Objective 1.1**: Graduates will identify important theoretical and research-based characteristics of well-developed curricula and use them to analyze curricula.
- **Objective 1.2:** Graduates will identify historical and contemporary issues that have implications for curricular selection and change, including, but not limited to, second language learners, developing a global perspective, state and national standards, and "workplace know-how."
- **Objective 2.1:** Graduates will use learning and instructional theories and research findings to analyze instructional practices
- **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.
- Students' perceptions of their level of preparedness on 15 items related to professional dispositions and practice.

2. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?**

a. **Graduate Writing Requirement Assignment**
Instructor A taught (a) one on-campus, non-cohorted section (Fall 2016) where an estimated 75% were teachers in grades PreK-12 and (b) one section (Summer 2016) for students in the Fresno Teacher Residency Program (FTRP), where students earn their M.A.Ed.-C&I degree and either two teaching credentials (Multiple Subject plus a Foundational-Level Single Subject credential in either mathematics or science) or a single subject credential in 1.5-2 years. Instructor B taught (a) one Fall 2016 section of CI 250 in Madera, CA, for a new master's cohort and (b) one Fall 2016 section for a cohort of FTRP students. Both instructors used the same rubric to grade the writing assignments, where a score of 3 ("Good") or 4 ("Excellent") was required in each category in order to pass the GWR. In last year's assessment report, it was noted that the first-time pass-rate for the FTRP cohort members was considerably lower than it was for the non-cohorted, on-campus students. One instructor of the cohort recommended that CI 250 be scheduled later in the FTRP students' credential/master's course trajectory (not as one of the initial courses), while the other FTRP instructor felt that the course prepared them for subsequent courses.

b. **Comprehensive Exam**
In addition to analyzing student performance via the Graduate Writing Requirement assignment and the Implementation and Analysis of Teaching assignment, the instructors of CI 250 and CI 275 developed Comprehensive Exam (CE) questions assessing Objectives

1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, and 4.1. The exams required of all students in the Fresno Teacher Residency Program unless they specifically opt to write a project or thesis, which is rare. The graduate faculty of MAE-C&I have determined that only students who are in special accelerated programs such as the FTRP will be allowed the CE option unless there is a strong rationale for taking the CE. A CE was administered in Fall 2016 and Summer 2017 to two FTRP cohorts. The next CE for an FTRP cohort will be administered in December 2017.

c. Exit Surveys

Data from two instruments assessing student perceptions of program quality and attainment of skills and dispositions have been reviewed in the past as part of this annual report. For a number of years, the KSOEHD Survey was given to students who applied to graduate, or (more recently) a common link was provided so students could fill out the survey online at any time. This survey contained 15 Likert-type items which asked students to assess the impact the program had on their professional growth (measures of professional dispositions). The survey also included open-ended items (major strengths of the program; suggestions for potential change), which provided important and useful information for program coordinators. In 2016, this survey evolved into the Kremen End-of-Year Survey, which included the 15 disposition items. In May 2016, each 2015-16 graduate was sent a unique link to this revised survey. Subsequently, we reported the number of MAE-C&I students who completed this survey and their responses to each item, noting how well the students felt that the program prepared them to do (e.g., Integrate theoretical foundations in my professional practice. Access the research in my field.). These findings were shared with program faculty by the MAE-C&I program coordinator. We assume that in May 2017, each 2016-17 graduate was sent this survey again.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness was responsible for the second of the two surveys: a survey conducted for the Division of Research and Graduate Studies of graduating master's and doctoral students. This sentence appeared at the bottom of the Application to Graduate (but apparently didn't during Spring 2017, a transition semester): "IMPORTANT NOTE: Please take the Graduating Students Survey by clicking on the following link – https://fresnostate.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0lk7ZagnvdtioKh." This URL led the student to a survey that had students rate their classes (relevant, current, available, challenging) and program faculty (knowledgeable about degree requirements and deadlines, helpful, committed, timely in feedback, and available), among other questions. An open-ended section asks about the most notable aspects of their graduate experience and recommendations for improvement. We felt that this provided extremely useful information in the past.

3. What did you discover from the data?

(a) Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR) Assignment

The following chart summarizes the number of students who passed the GWR with a score of 3 ("Good") or 4 ("Excellent") in each rubric category on the first, second, or third

attempt, as well as the number who haven't yet passed the GWR, broken down by instructor and cohort:

Instructor	Passed GWR on 1st attempt	Passed GWR on 2nd attempt	Passed GWR on 3rd attempt	Haven't passed	Total # of students
A	24 (89%)	3(11%)	0	0	27
A (FTRP)	1 (3%)	32 (97%)	0	0	33
B (Madera)	13 (100%)*	0	0	0	13
B (FTRP)	19 (100%)*	0	0	0	19

Instructor A reported that students in both sections of CI 250 were encouraged to submit a preliminary draft of the GWR paper. These drafts were read for content, APA style, and language mechanics. Feedback included suggested APA style resources, review of citations, highlighting of colloquialisms, maintaining objectivity, comments on general academic language, and other suggestions. The instructor developed and included a sixteen-item scoring rubric that indicated revision specifics. After editing reflecting the preliminary feedback, students submitted their research papers. The majority of the papers in the TRP section needed additional minor editing. After changes were made, the students met the requirement.

* Instructor B reported that all 32 students passed the GWR, but she did not report whether it was after one or more attempts. She stated that she was very pleased with the performance of the students.

(b) Comprehensive Exam

The following chart provides a summary of the scores of the 18 students who took the Comprehensive Exam in Fall 2016 and the 20 students who took the Comprehensive Exam (CE) in Summer 2017. All of these students participated in the Fresno Teacher Residency Program (FTRP) cohort to earn both a teaching credential (or two) and MAE-C&I degree. The FTRP cohort that took the CE in the fall had a middle school math and science focus. The FTRP cohort that took the CE in the summer had a primary grades (PreK-3) focus.

The responses to each item were rated as follows by the instructors of the courses (who also wrote the prompts): 1–Fail, 2–Pass, or 3–Exemplary. All students passed the CE on the first attempt. In Fall 2016, six of the students (33.3%) earned all 3s and three of the students earned all 2s (16.7%). Performance was mixed (2s and 3s) for the other nine students (50%). In Summer 2017, none earned all 3s (0%), ten (50%) students earned all 2s, and the other ten students earned a mix of 2s and 3s (50%).

Rubric Score	Fall 2016 (FTRP Gr. 4-8)				Summer 2017 (FTRP Gr. PreK-3)			
	CI 250	CI 250	CI 275	CI 275	CI 250	CI 250	CI 275	CI 275
3	7	10	10	11	4	5	6	1
2	11	8	8	7	16	15	14	19

1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(c) Exit Surveys

- <u>Kremen End-of-Year Survey:</u>

We requested this information and were told that as of 21 September 2017, the data has been delayed, so we do not have any to report.

- <u>OIE Exit Survey (Graduating Students Survey)</u>

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness was contacted for survey data, but to date, we have not received notice of any data for our graduates for 2016-17. We learned that Debbie Young in the Career Development Center, is taking over surveying graduates. The MAE-C&I coordinator communicated with Debbie at some length regarding her plan to survey graduates during the final week of the semester (presumably each graduation period) and follow up with those who had not yet responded to increase response rate. All of this is outstanding, and we greatly look forward to getting the data and reporting the findings next year.

4. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

(a) Graduate Writing Requirement (GWR) Assignment:

The success rate of Instructor A's students on this assignment may be indicative of the structured support and guidance the students are given on their papers prior to submitting them for a grade. Students in the time-intensive FTRP program are typically recent graduates of an undergraduate program and take both credential and graduate coursework while student teaching. Thus the master's degree candidates in this program are typically younger and less experienced than the average student in the MAE-C&I program. They also take more courses while teaching during the day than the typical master's student. All of these factors can play a role in course assignment success, including the GWR. This may be why the students in Instructor A's FTRP section required another submission before passing the GRW assignment. We will ask for more details of the preparation and evaluation process used by Instructor B (and all other part-time instructors who teach CI 250) for 2017-18.

In Instructor A's course, Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1 are addressed in seminars through group analyses of textbooks, by individual presentations, through group projects, by attending a library research presentation developed specifically for CI 250, through seminar discussions and analyses of current issues, by reading and analyzing articles/journals, and by sharing their research papers.

Instructor A reported that she administers an informal survey at the end of each semester, and CI 250 students are asked to review the course: What should stay the same, what should

change, other suggestions. Students indicated that they were satisfied with the course would not change anything.

We have encouraged all students with writing challenges to utilize the services of the Graduate Writing Studio and will continue to do so.

(b) Comprehensive Exam

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

(c) Exit Surveys

- Kremen End-of-Year Survey
We can continue to encourage students to fill out the Kremen Exit Survey when they receive the link, but since we are not notified when our students receive the link or how they are reminded to fill out the survey, it's hard to effectively support the effort.

What we need to find time to do is to convene our graduate faculty to create an alumni survey based on our program outcomes and then send it to graduates from the past 3 years (probably using Qualtrics). Since we are going to need to evaluate our program as we head toward program elevation (from an M.A. in Education-Curriculum and Instruction Option to an M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction), now is the time to more deeply review our program goals and objectives.

- OIE Graduating Students Survey

We were again disappointed to learn that there were apparently no OIE Exit Survey data for our program graduates, despite there being a relatively prominent link at the bottom of the application to graduate. As noted earlier, we are extremely pleased with the new university graduating student assessment plan.

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

Last year we noted that the student success rate in online courses for teachers was very low for the members of our program with no teaching experience (especially members of the football coaching staff). More appropriate electives were strongly recommended during advising sessions with the MAE-C&I program coordinator, and success in **electives in other departments** (e.g., Kinesiology) were evident among most students. We still have challenges

with some students (particularly those on the coaching staff who are on the road coaching games or recruiting prospects and who must take at least 8 units a semester) meeting the 3.0 GPA requirement. We will continue looking for ways to help support their success.

5. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

During 2017-18, we will continue to use the following methods to measure program objectives:

Graduate Writing Requirement Analysis: Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1
- Objective 1.1:   Graduates will identify important theoretical and research-based characteristics of well-developed curricula and use them to analyze curricula.
- Objective 1.2:   Graduates will identify historical and contemporary issues that have implications for curricular selection and change, including, but not limited to, second language learners, developing a global perspective, state and national standards, and "workplace know- how."
- Objective 2.1: Graduates will use learning and instructional theories and research findings to analyze instructional practices
- Objective 4.1:   Graduates will communicate research-based arguments for educational issues, policies, or research design.

Implementation and Analysis of Teaching Assignment Analysis: Objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2
- Objective 2.1: Graduates will use learning and instructional theories and research findings to analyze instructional practices
- Objective 2.2: Graduates will implement instructional strategies that facilitate learning for cognitively, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse populations.
- Objective 3.2:   Graduates will develop tools to assess students' content knowledge and attitudes, and evaluate instructional practices or programs, recognizing the biases within different forms of assessment.

Comprehensive Exam: Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 4.1

- Alumni Survey: We plan to develop an alumni survey to assess graduates' retrospective view of the program and also their current leadership roles (Objectives 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3), as well as to assess their use of technology in their instruction (Objective 3.3), especially if they also earned a Certificate of Advanced Instruction in Educational Technology (CASET).
- Objective 4.1:   Graduates will communicate research-based arguments for educational issues, policies, or research design.
- Objective 4.2:   Graduates will become advocates for educational reforms that meet the needs of all students.
- Objective 4.3:   Graduates will assume leadership roles and utilize resources in their professional community.

Exit Surveys: These will be used to assess educator dispositions, as well as students' program perceptions and recommendations.

Addendum: While not listed explicitly in our SOAP timeline, the graduate faculty did discuss how we assess the quality of our projects. In May 2017, our program's nominees for both the Outstanding Project Award and Outstanding Thesis Award were selected by committees as the top project and thesis in the Kremen School of Education. While we are very pleased with this and feel that it reflects our program faculty's commitment to excellence, we feel that we need to provide all faculty who supervise projects with support to evaluate the quality of projects and theses. The graduate faculty have reviewed the dissertation rubric and guidelines used in the DPELFS program, and some faculty plan to adapt this for their use in evaluating projects and theses. Other faculty feel that using rubrics is overly-restrictive, results in a "check-box" mentality, and reduces student creativity and flow. One shared this article by Alfie Kohn ("The Trouble with Rubrics"): http://bitly.com/Kohn-Rubrics We will continue our discussion!

6. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**
   Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state "no progress."

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

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

- To promote the MAE-C&I program, the Program Coordinator has created and distributed informational flyers about the program over the past 10 years. She regularly distributes copies of the FTRP promotional flyer as well, often taking a copy to conferences in case there is interest in the program.
- Dr. Fry Bohlin maintains her Twitter account for the MAE-C&I program (https://twitter.com/Fresno_MAE_CI) and actively tweets information, student pictures, etc., to support and celebrate the MAE-C&I graduate students (and program graduates), as well as to promote the MAE-C&I program
- The MAE-C&I website is kept updated with information about the master's degree program, as well as the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASET): http://www.fresnostate.edu/kremen/graduate/ma-education.html
- Dr. Fry Bohlin emails all students regularly with detailed program updates and advising notes. She also maintains a very detailed spreadsheet where the progress of all 150+ students is tracked and student information is noted. This helps with targeted and "just in time" advising and student success in the program. This is particularly important since half of the units in the program are electives, and almost no two students have the same set of electives. In addition, a number of students are also pursuing a CASET, which increases the number of required units by 9 for the MAE-C&I students. The FTRP students are also earning at least one teaching credential.
- We continue to promote our program internationally with the assistance of our graduate students from other countries. We admitted two students from Vietnam, one from China,

and one from Taiwan for fall 2017 admission. There were 37 MAE-C&I students admitted to the program for Fall 2017 (plus a Fall 2017 cohort of 12 FTRP students and a Summer 2017 cohort of 20 FTRP students).

(2) <u>Increase the number of courses offered in an online or hybrid format.</u>

- The MAE-C&I faculty noted that student success and rich, meaningful interaction among classmates and faculty is typically not as great in the online courses as in face-to-face classes, so there has not been a strong motivation to develop online courses. However, CI 225 continues to be primarily online, and some MAE-C&I students take online courses such as CI 240 and CI 241 (courses developed for the MAT program) as electives. Some students take online sections of ERE 153 and ERE 220 to fulfill their research course requirements for the program. To help increase student access to courses, alternative scheduling of classes has been implemented (e.g., 4-5 Saturdays and summer course offerings) and district-based cohorts have been established.

(3) <u>Continue partnering with local school districts to form graduate cohorts.</u>

- All of our Madera Unified School District cohort members should graduate this coming year (2017-18).
- The Teacher Residency Program began in Fall 2013 as an innovative and powerful partnership between Fresno Unified School District (FUSD) and the Kremen School with S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation grant support. While the initial TRP cohort did not include a master's degree, the university's first unified Multiple Subject credential (and Foundational-Level Mathematics or FL General Science credential) and master's (MAE-C&I) program was initiated in 2014, with students admitted to the master's program that fall. In all, we have had six credential/MAE-C&I cohorts, all with financial support from (a) a 5-year U.S. Department of Education 2014 Teacher Quality Partnership grant administered by FUSD and (b) the campus's Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI), which provides funding for membership in professional organizations, conference attendance, and credential-related fees.
- We continue to offer courses at times convenient for teachers, including 4-6:50 p.m. and 7-9:50 p.m. Monday-Friday, all day Saturday, and during the summer when possible.

(4) <u>Continually revise our courses for relevance and currency.</u>

- MAE-C&I program faculty take this very seriously, continually updating course requirements, assignments, and resources. Appropriate and current use of instructional technologies is modeled. This is facilitated through the excellent, cutting edge computer labs in the Kremen Education Building (ED 157, ED 165, and ED 169), where most of the educational technology courses and many of the ERE courses (ERE 153, ERE 220, and ERE 288) are taught.

(5) <u>Model and infuse current technologies in our courses.</u>

- See (4) above. The MAE-C&I program has benefitted from its close relationship with the

Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASET) program. Many MAE-C&I students take at least one of the courses designed for this certificate program, and a number of students elect to earn the Certificate in addition to the master's degree, providing them with documentation of their additional expertise in educational technology. Due to budgetary restrictions this coming year, we are going to reduce the number of offerings each semester by one course and only offer CI 225 once per year like the other CASET courses. The intent is to increase class sizes, while still meeting the needs of the students each year.

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

- Since 2009, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has hired six new faculty members, (Dr. Frederick Nelson, Dr. Libbi Miller, Dr. Mariya Yukhymenko, Dr. Trang Phan, Dr. Emy Lopez Phillips, and Dr. Myung Shin), all of whom have graduate faculty status. We received approval to hire two faculty members in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction this coming year (2017-18) and hope they will be part of our graduate faculty, as we will need more faculty to teach core MAE-C&I courses and provide project and thesis advisement. We also will need faculty who can teach educational technology courses since the CASET Coordinator, Dr. Roy Bohlin, is now Chair of the C&I Department and Dr. Phan is Director of INTERESC. Further, Dr. Nelson (who, like Dr. Bohlin, taught CI 275) is Chair of the Liberal Studies Department, which further challenges course coverage.

(7) <u>Maintain state and national program accreditation (e.g., CTC, NCATE, NAEYC, etc.).</u>
- All initial and advanced programs in the Kremen School of Education and Human Development received outstanding reviews during the last state (CTC) and national (NCATE) accreditation visits in March 2014. No areas for improvement were identified.

M.A. in Education – Educational Leadership and Administration
Dr. Mabel Franks, Program Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

The Educational Leadership and Administration degree program provides two pathways for those pursuing a Masters of Arts degree in Education: P-12 Option Educational Leadership and Administration and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Option Educational Leadership in Administration: Higher Education, Administration, and Leadership (HEAL). The Department of Educational Leadership at Fresno State continues to work toward elevation of two separate master's degrees in response to major changes adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and to meet the requirement of Executive Order 1071. For the 2017-2018 academic year, our pathways have a combined total of 193 students (150 P-12; and 43 HEAL). Instruction is delivered through a cohort model; the six P-12 cohorts hold classes in partnership districts throughout the Central Valley. The two HEAL cohorts operate on the Fresno State campus.

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program continues a review of current course competency tasks to ensure tight alignment between the newly adopted California Administrator Performance expectations (CAPEs) and the California Administrator Performance Assessments (CalAPA), scheduled to be fully implemented in 2019-2020. Our P-12 program continues participation in field testing, scoring and Standard Setting (2017-2018) in preparation for the major change in K-12 administrator service credentialing. At that time, all enrolling in a Commission-approved preparation program will be required to demonstrate competency on three of three leadership cycle assessments as part of their preliminary administrator services requirements.

2016-2017 Assessment Activity of the Educational leadership and Administration Program (P-12 pathway)

All P-12 full-time faculty meet monthly as an Academic Task Force to review current practice experiences, field work and performance tasks across cohorts to determine level of alignment between learning activities, work products, criteria for success and student learner outcomes, as per the California Administrative Performance Expectations (CAPEs). As a result of this on-going professional and collaborative investigative approach, adjustments have been made to current assignments and new, more effective protocols, strategies, and tools have emerged to deepen understanding, integrate/transfer skills and evidence level of learning, such as use of videos for self-assessment, observations to understand/change perceptions, and to build competency.

Our competency/performance-based learning and assessment system requires frequent review, reassessment and resubmission of individual student work products. Individualized feedback, differentiated resources and additional learning experiences are integrated as necessary to ensure administrator Candidates show competency.

Below is a sampling of student learning outcomes derived from the CAPEs assessed during pilot of the new California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA), Learning Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth, including competency task measures, indicators and standards of success for each step of the four-step task (Investigate, Plan, Act and Reflect) as well as results, discoveries from results, and adjustments or changes made based on the results.

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/Direct Measures
	Scoring Rubric Indicator: Competent/Exceeds (4-5) or Quality (3) on 5-point (levels) rubric. 100% of students evidencing Competent or Quality for each student success criterion on the scoring rubric
Step 1: Investigate • Investigate the context of the teacher observation/ coaching practices at the candidate's school and context of a volunteer teacher to be observed and coached, and use findings to shape plans for conducting a coaching cycle • Use knowledge of the CSTP and the Continuum of Teaching Practice to support the growth and development of a teacher throughout a coaching cycle.	• Written Narrative: Summary of Context for the Coaching Cycle • (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) • Forms or documents used for classroom observation/coaching (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric
Step 2: Plan • Use knowledge of the CSTP and the Continuum of Teaching Practice, TK-12 student academic content standards and appropriate instructional practices to plan and conduct a pre-observation meeting for a coaching cycle. • Plan and conduct a pre-observation meeting for a coaching cycle that meets competency.	2 Written Narratives (Rounds 1 & 2): Summaries of Pre-Observation Meetings (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) 2 video clips (3-6 minutes each) for Rounds 1 & 2 Pre-Observation Mtg (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) 2 Completed Annotation Templates - one for pre-observation video clip (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric)
Step 3: Act • Observe classroom planning and instruction in accordance with LEA policy and practices. • Conduct a classroom observation and collect data/evidence, related to CSTP element(s) • Analyze class observation evidence of teacher effectiveness based on student work and learning outcomes. • Identify teacher areas of strength and teacher areas for growth/development and improvement based on observation evidence. • Conduct a post-observation meeting and (a) provide and effectively communicate timely, unbiased, evidence-based feedback, and (b) provide and effectively communicate constructive suggestions • Apply principles of reflective, courageous, conversation during a post-observation meeting.	Volunteer teacher lesson plans for the 2 Rounds (R1 & R2) of classroom observations (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) 2 video clips (3-5 minutes each) of volunteer teacher's instruction (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) Notes from 2 observations (R1 & R2) and/or forms to document observations (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) 2 video clips (8-10 minutes) for Rounds 1 & 2 Post-observation Meetings (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) 2 Completed Annotation Templates - one for each post-observation meeting video clip (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric)
STEP 4: Reflect • Reflect on and learn from leadership practices used to support the growth and development of a teacher	Video clips with annotations (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) Reflective Narrative (written or video)

• Ethics and Integrity: make decisions, model, and behave in ways that demonstrate professionalism, ethics, integrity, justice, and equity and hold staff to the same standard.	(Criteria for student success and scoring rubric)

Discovery from the Data

Results for this assessment project were derived from n=70 master's students who completed a four-step (investigate, plan, act, reflect) performance assessment with each step individually assessed for competence using a rubric. This performance assessment was in direct alignment with the newly developed California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) – Leadership Cycle 3, which was piloted throughout California during the spring of 2017. A maximum of 15 students from our program were selected to participate in the pilot and 14 students actually uploaded all assessment components to the pilot website for external review. All 70 students who were enrolled in the P-12 pathway EAD 263 course during spring 2017 completed the four-part performance assessment. This assessment included narrative written responses, video-taped segments of candidates conducting pre and post observation coaching conversations with teachers, data collection artifacts using appropriate data collection instruments based on identified CSTP of focus and narrative/video reflection. Candidates must achieve a rubric score of "4" or "5" (Competent/Extends) on each of the four sub assessments. If a student does not score at competent/extends, then the student must redo and resubmit until the student performs at a competent level.

Approximately half of our 70 students had to revise and resubmit one of four sub assessments. Most of the students had to revise and resubmit the investigate portion of the assessment due to surface level responses of their investigations. All 70 students achieved competent/extends on all four sub-assessments to achieve competency on the entire Leadership Cycle 3 – Performance Assessment by May 10, 2017.

The following are the relative strengths and weaknesses that emerged from analysis based on analytical rubric data and student and faculty interview data.

Relative strengths:
- Skill development in collecting non-judgmental observation data.
- Depth of candidate analysis, reflection and conversation.
- Candidates' mindset – willing to be vulnerable, accepting of honest feedback, and effectively used feedback to grow and develop in their skills – continuous improvement.
- Candidates' work with teachers in the field fostered a positive culture related to an administrator's role in supporting the growth and development teacher as well as elevated teacher knowledge and skill.
- Technology skill for video assessment portions did not appear to be a barrier.

Relative Weaknesses:
- Attention to rubric detail in narrative responses – investigation portion
- Current context in the field is more evaluative than coaching, which created a steeper learning curve for candidates to develop coaching language and the skills of coaching up a teacher in the expected time frame.

- Current context – documents used to provide feedback to teachers more evaluative, which created a steeper learning curve for candidates to develop knowledge of matching data collection tool with CSTP area of focus and skill in using tools (use of tool and presenting the data fro decision-making) in the expected time frame.
- Use of CSTP to determine area of focus.

Changes made as a Result of Data Analysis

Assessment data collected from the administration of Leadership Cycle 3 performance assessment direct measure integrated in EAD 263 provided valuable data and information to drive curricular decisions and course revisions in alignment with the newly adopted performance and content standards and CTC assessment in order to obtain a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential:

- Maintain knowledge and skill development of non-judgmental data collection in earlier courses in the program sequence (EAD 261, 272, and 280T).
- Provide authentic modeling of performance skills and structure for peer review of assessment artifacts using analytical rubrics.
- Begin development of coaching language and skill earlier in program sequence (before EAD 263).
- Throughout coursework prior to EAD 263, reference and connect P-12 standards, instruction and assessment conversations to the CSTP.

2016-2017 Learning Outcome Assessed Across P-12 and HEAL Pathways

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

Instrument Used to Assess Outcome

Two sections of *EAD 261: Introduction to Educational Administration* in Fall 2016 were selected to conduct this assessment activity. EAD 261 was selected because all enrolled students were in their first semester of their first year of their graduate program.

Department faculty (P-12 and HEAL) collaboratively developed and implemented a criterion-based scoring rubric to collect data needed to inform and drive next step decisions: (a) specific graduate/candidate competencies and support and (b) program cohort areas of focus.

Student Learning Outcomes	Competency Tasks/Direct Measures
Present information on a given topic though written communication, clearly, logically and analytically: HEAL Pathway	Written Narrative (timed) (Criteria for student success and scoring rubric) Scoring Rubric Indicator: Meets Competence on 3-point rubric.

Within the structure of the course curriculum, complete a Short Essay II assignment P-12 Pathway Three-hour written assessment on an assigned topic related to school leadership. Use evidence from readings on research and/or best practices in education to make connections and support arguments.	100% of students evidencing Competent for each student success criterion on the scoring rubric

Results

HEAL Pathway
Results for this assessment project were derived from n=17 master's students in EAD 261 in Fall 2015. Results showed 100% of students met the graduate writing competency with n=2 (11%) students receiving recommendations to visit the Graduate Writing Studio (GWS) at some point during their first year of graduate studies.

P-12 Pathway
Results for this assessment were derived from n=40 master's students in Fall 2016 (n=23) and Spring 2017 (n =17). Results showed 100% of students met the graduate writing competency with n=4 (10%) students receiving recommendations to visit the Graduate Writing Studio (GWS) at some point during their first year of graduate studies.

Discoveries from Results
These results show that graduate students in the department of Educational Leadership demonstrate effective written communication competencies using generative writing prompts. In addition, results from this assessment activity assist faculty in guiding students in specific areas of growth and development and provide a specific focus for our students' work with the university's GWS.

The following are the relative strengths and weaknesses that emerged from analysis based on the rubric. Individual relative strengths and weaknesses were shared with students and some students were guided to seek additional support, such as the GWS, for areas in need of growth and development.

Relative strengths:
- Students take a position and clearly and logically present points /information.
- Supporting evidence is relevant and sound.
- Papers included intentional references to research and best practices.
- Academic language and vocabulary are used to emphasize points and make connections. Organization of papers was logical.
- Students adhered to basic grammar and paragraph structure and use of correct verb tense.

Relative Weaknesses:

- Students struggled to "raise important issues or ideas" beyond those at a fundamental level.
- Written responses generally followed a standardized format; some responses followed a general, sentence structure without variation.
- Limited references were made to research.
- References to research more often discussed through quotes and meaning of quotes rather than deep analysis or supporting evidence.
- Connections between ideas somewhat superficial.
- Grammar and spelling errors, but were not distracting or significant.
- L-2 interference noticeable in four of the essays (written responses), but did not interfere with meaning, or otherwise detract from the flow of the papers.

Changes made as a Result of Data Analysis

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

The assessment emphasized the importance for consistent use of writing assessments across pathways. The activity provided students timely feedback during their first semester of graduate school. This time of rapid transition and increased academic expectations is crucial for the students we serve at Fresno State. Several students sought and received tutoring through the graduate writing lab independently, as a self-improvement growth action.

The California Administrator Performance Standards (CAPEs) emphasize the need for leaders to develop and apply a variety of effective written communications techniques and methods to clearly inform, motivate and share information and progress. Because written communication appears in many forms and genres, successful written communication for educational leaders depends on "mastery of the conventions of the written language, facility with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience, and other situation-specific factors" (WASC, 2013, p. 58).

Progress from Last Program Review Action Plan

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

Our program participated in the MA in Education University Program Review in Fall 2016. Electronic documents for the review can be accessed at http://fresnostate.edu/kremen/cctc/noncred/review.html. University Graduate Review Committee gave commendations and had no areas for improvement.

The Educational Leadership and Administration Program submitted a Program Review to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Accreditation Team in December 2016 to meet the new Program Standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC). Program Review electronic documents can be accessed at the following weblink: http://www.fresnostate.edu/kremen/cctc/admin/eadprogramreview.html

Please note: Due to Safari limitations, and for best results, it is highly recommended that Firefox or Chrome be used to open links to documents contained in this review.

In Spring 2017 we received feedback from CTC Accreditation stating that based on our Program Review submission, **our program** was deemed **fully aligned.**

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

However, as stated in the opening section of this Assessment Report under **Context**, the Department of Educational Leadership faculty are pursuing a course of action to elevate the option, Educational Leadership and Administration*,* in the Master of Arts in Education, to two independent master's degree programs. This work has begun in conjunction with on-going integration of California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) components. Progress regarding this elevation and integration occurs weekly as evidenced by the work already completed by the Academic Task Force and HEAL Teams to date. This work continues as described in the **Context** section of the report.

M.S in Counseling
Dr. Chris Lucey, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.

SLO: Apply professional counseling expertise under direct supervision
SLO: Conduct effective counseling
SLO: Maintain academic and pratica curricula consistent with the standards set by the Counsel for the Accreditation of Counselor Education and Related Programs (CACREP).

2. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be "On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric."

SLO 1.4. Counselors-in-training undergo evaluation in multiple courses, most notably COUN 200 and COUN 208 and additionally for students enroll in the MFCC program option, 238. Skills rubrics were developed to assess student progress and development. In addition, feedback was sought from community stakeholders (i.e. site supervisors and employers) through interviews and meetings as well as written feedback regarding counselor-in- training progress in COUN 219, COUN 239, and COUN 249. Finally, all students in the program undergo a Clinical Review in COUN 208 in which a dispositional assessment of professional fit is conducted.

SLO 1.2. Counselors-in-training undergo evaluation in multiple courses, most notably COUN 200 and COUN 208. Skills rubrics were developed to assess student progress and development. In addition, feedback was sought from community stakeholders (i.e. site supervisors and employers).

3. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

From Fall 2016 to spring 2017, all students enrolled in the COUN 208 Individual Counseling Practicum course were evaluated by the Counselor Education programs' Clinical Review Committee. On the whole, most students' progress were developmentally on target in all areas. Only two needed extra advising and mentoring to improve and only one student did not pass Clinical Review due to dispositional concerns. Programmatic weakness is most evident in students' ability to articulate and apply counseling theories. This was evident in practice, in feedback from new faculty, and in communication with stakeholders.

A review of Employer/Supervisor surveys during the internship course found high reported satisfaction with the program's training of Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling (MFCC) student counselors. A rating of 3.5 on the Employer's Evaluation Forms in educational training and clinical expertise is the program's benchmark. Employers/Supervisors rated the MFCC program's educational training and clinical preparation with an overall mean of 4.37 on a 5-point scale (n=52). Most comments on the program were extremely positive. Several suggested improvements included greater emphasis on the integration of theoretical and clinical learning throughout the program. The results from the Comprehensive Exam and feedback from employers/supervisors indicated that students were able to demonstrate a firm grasp of theoretical knowledge associated with counseling and also demonstrated excellent counseling skills but could benefit from integrating this knowledge in a global way into clinical practice.

In terms of the School Counseling program, all Employer's Evaluation Forms rated students' educational training and clinical expertise at 3 or above on the 1-5 scale of satisfaction with positive comments. Students scored highest on their ability to counsel others and multicultural sensitivity. Students need to improve their ability to diagnose and develop treatment plans. Many students pursuing School Counseling take an assessment course but are not required to take a diagnostic course, given the solution and strength-focused philosophy of most of the school counseling theories. All students received ratings from their on-site school supervisors ranging from "acceptable", to "A fine counselor, of great value to the profession", to, "One of the few very outstanding counselors I have known". No student (zero) received the rating of "unacceptable".

For the Student Advising and College Counseling (SACC) program, 28 internship evaluation forms have been reviewed and areas for improvement have been identified.

Areas for improvement (either marked as N/A or 1-2) were needed in the following areas: promotes preventative methods in a student service plan effectively, applies remedial methods available to students effectively, applies principles of career development planning with students, which may include academic and personal development, uses assessment and/or advising instruments (N=2 students), makes clear group presentations and/or case presentations during staffing meetings (N=9), conducts research activities to address current needs and progress of student service areas (N=12).

4. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

Information from the assessment activities were brought to program and department meetings for review, discussions, and planning. Based on the assessments, the program faculty is improving individual mentoring and advising, documenting student progress, making changes to the curriculum or communicating to all instructors on areas that need to be included in each course. The department is increasing support to new faculty by connecting them to seasoned instructors and providing an orientation. Increasing students' knowledge in and application of theory is an ongoing discussion in the department. A committee has been set to examine our curriculum and identify courses where we could include theories and application of theories beyond what we already offered. Finally, CER department is enhancing communication with part-time instructors and site supervisors (both internship and practicum) about theory implication, is discussing ways to develop critical thinking skills and be able to evaluate different worldviews, perspectives, and theoretical orientations, and to be aware of different levels of cognitive & intellectual development among students and support them to integrate theories into practice.

Program specific changes for the Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling program are as follows:

Objective 5.2 Maintain academic and pratica curricula consistent with the standards set by the Counsel for the Accreditation of Counselor Education and
Related Programs (CACREP).

After reviewing Employer/Supervisor Surveys, student Practicum and Field-Placement evaluations, and discussions with community supervisors, faculty and students, the MFCC program added coursework in Couples Counseling. Since the fall of 2016, a 3-unit course in couples counseling was added to the degree requirements for all MFCC students. The delivery of credit hours by noncore faculty is an issue that the Department of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation has been addressing as the program is out of compliance with our national accreditation body CACREP. The high number of part-time and adjunct faculty has been the result of faculty attrition and increased numbers of

1. Students entering the various counseling options. The CER department has been addressing this issue. During the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 Semesters, the programs reduced their admissions of qualified applicants. Each program is now only taking in from 20 to 25 students. The program will continue to restrict the numbers of students admitted ongoing. In addition, the CER department has hired two full-time tenured track faculty for the 2016 – 2017 academic year, who specialize in MFCC with a focus in Latino mental health disparities. The department has also been approved for three new tenure-track position specializing in MFCC, SACC and School Counseling. The reduction of students entering the program combined with the addition of new faculty is expected to reverse this trend.
2. In terms of the Student Affairs and College Counseling (SACC) program, the following strategies are being implemented, (1) better communicate with interns and site supervisors on the evaluation criteria during the initial meetings, (2) process with interns during group supervision regarding process & challenges at their internship sites, and (3) share the evaluation forms with interns in the beginning of the semester regarding a variety

activities/counseling types (research, staff meeting, using assessments) expected from internship.

3. In the school counseling program, the program coordinator is increasing communication with instructors and site supervisors to discover whether we need to include more content areas or if our assessment tool is relevant.

5. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

The Counselor Education programs will continue assessing students skills, knowledge and dispositions during Coun208 (practicum) and during internship courses (Coun249, Coun219, Coun239). The programs will also continue to conduct ongoing Clinical Reviews to assess student concerns and provide support. Lastly, the programs will begin the process of addressing new CACREP accreditation standards that will require increased standardization of assessments across the curriculum and to address FTES to FTEF ratios. The programs will also be addressing CTC accreditation requirements.

6. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state "no progress."

The FTEF to FTES ratios have also been an ongoing issue between the Department of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation and the University administration. As noted in above, the CER department has reduced the number of applicants accepted into the program, recently hired two full-time tenured track faculty and the program currently has open searches for three new full-time faculty member to begin in Fall 2018. The hiring of new faculty as well as continued efforts to manage enrollments will be made to decrease the FTE ratio.

Additional Guidelines: If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.

The assessments will be attached to this document below.

M. S. in Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling
(Formally Masters of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling)
Dr. Steven Koobatian, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Introduction:

During academic year 2016-2017 the Master of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling Program was completely overhauled to achieve national dual accreditation. In order to stay current with national trends in the counseling profession, major core areas/domains were addressed to engineer a new curriculum and program name change. These changes have had a major impact on redeveloping our curriculum/ courses that are directly linked to student Learning Outcomes.

The program faculty worked intensively during 2016-2017 and obtained department, college, academic senate, university, and state chancellor approval to change our name and align our curriculum to meet new accreditation standards for our graduate students to obtain national certification and California licensure.

We are now the "Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling Program" and we were notified in summer 2017 that we are dually accredited by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) and Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)- a specialized accrediting body recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

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

In the SOAP scheduled for this review, the program focused on the following areas:

a. Review/Revised Comprehensive Exam
b. Review/Revise Student Pre-Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 237)
c. Review/Revise Student Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 238)
d. Review/Revise Student Internship Evaluation (REHAB 239)

2. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?

a. Review/Revised Comprehensive Exam:

The comprehensive examination is under continual review by the program faculty. Questions contained in this examination must also be in alignment with the new accreditation standards/domains.

b. Review/Revise Student Pre-Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 237)
c. Review/Revise Student Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 238)

d. Review/Revise Student Internship Evaluation (REHAB 239)

Program faculty utilized criteria from the major domains of the CORE and CACREP accreditation standards to review, revise, and reengineer Rehab 237, Rehab 238, and Rehab 239.

3. What did you discover from the data?

a. Review/Revised Comprehensive Exam:

The program faculty continues to review the content of the multiple choice and essay questions to ensure alignment with the dual accreditation standards. This examination is still under review and evolving each academic year.

We are pleased to report that our student outcomes in passing the comprehensive examination on the first attempt during academic year 2016-2017, was the highest compared to the last two prior academic years.

In 2016-2017 academic year, 91% of students passed this examination on the first attempt and 100% passed on the second.

(In 2015-2016, 69% of students passed first attempt and 100% second attempt; in 2014-2015 62% or students passed first attempt and 100% passed second attempt).

a. Review/Revise Student Pre-Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 237)
b. Review/Revise Student Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 238)
c. Review/Revise Student Internship Evaluation (REHAB 239)

In line of the need to reengineer our pre-practicum, practicum, and intern ship courses, we have developed new evaluation standards/rubrics to comply with the major domains of the CORE and CACREP accreditation standards. These changes are documented in question #4 below.

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

a. Review/Revised Comprehensive Exam

From feedback we have received from students and faculty, it was decided to allow one additional hour for the essay portion of the examination. Previously, the student was required to answer three essay questions across the major content domain areas within two hours. The timeline has now increased to three hours for completion

The objective portion of the examination consists of 100 questions with a two-hour allowance for completion. Some questions were eliminated/changed/added to maintain relevancy with the accreditation standards.

a. Review/Revise Student Pre-Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 237)

In the SOAP, Rehab 237 was previously titled "Case Practices in Rehabilitation Counseling" (4 units). This course has been re-engineered and retitled to "Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Services Case Management" (3 units). The title and course content was changed to reflect the new dual accreditation curriculum standards. Units were reduced due to deletion of former field placement requirements. Rubrics were completely changed to reflect the new course content to satisfy the accreditation domains. The new Rehab 237 rubrics are attached.

a. Review /Revise Student Practicum Evaluation (REHAB 238)

The title, course content, units, and rubrics have also been changed in Rehab 238. The former SOAP course title "Rehabilitation Counseling Practicum" (4 units) has been changed to "Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Services Practicum" (3 units).

These changes were designed to reflect the new dual accreditation curriculum standards and consistency with other accredited programs in rehabilitation and mental health counseling in the United States. Also, a new 71 page "Field Experience Manual" was developed to reflect the content area and student evaluation responsibilities/procedures. The new Rehab 238 rubrics and table of contents of the Field Experience Manual are attached.

a. Review/Revise Student Internship Evaluation (REHAB 239)

Similar to the two foregoing practicum course changes, the internship course has been significantly changed. In the SOAP plan, the former title Rehab 239 was "Internship in Rehabilitation Counseling" (12 units). The new Rehab 239 title is "Internship in Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling" (9 units). The title change and unit reduction was designed to reflect the new course content for the dual accreditation curriculum standards and consistency with other accredited programs in rehabilitation and mental health counseling in the United States. Also, the number of units will meet the California Licensure Requirements. The new Rehab 239 rubrics and the Field Experience Manual (attached) further document these changes.

5. What assessment activities will you be con ducting in the 2017-2018 academic year?

According to the SOAP on file with the university, we are scheduled to:

1. Review/Revise SOAP.
2. Review/Revise rubrics for next review.

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

Our major accomplishments were the program name change and national dual accreditations which are the gold standard s in our profession across the United States.

In fact, the MS Program in Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling at Fresno State has been ranked in the top 25 of "Best Graduate Schools" by the U.S. News & World Reports. (The only program at Fresno State University to receive this distinction). The program

faculty will continue to assess the validity of the comprehensive examination. Also, in accordance with the new accreditation standards, the program will be further evaluating compliance standards for faculty to student ratios as required by the CACREP accreditation. The program/department/college will be evaluating admission procedures and protocols in order to balance student admissions with faculty personnel.

Additional Guidelines

Please see attached Practicum and Internship Field Experience Manual (Table of Contents) and the new rubrics for Rehab 237, Rehab 238, and Rehab 239 courses that have been addressed in this 2016-2017 academic year Learning Outcomes Assessment report.

FIELD EXPERIENCE MANUAL
(PRACTICUM AND INTERNSHIP)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIELD EXPERIENCE MANUAL

(Practicum & Internship)

California State University, Fresno

Master of Science
in
Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRE-PRACTICUM EVALUATION

NEW REHAB 237 RUBRICS

Appendix 1 RUBRIC

Rehab 237

Chapter Presentation/Quiz Rubric

Group Members: _____

Category	Scoring Criteria	Points
Organization 5 points	-The type of presentation is appropriate for the topic and audience -Information is presented in a logical sequence -Presentation appropriately uses power point to engage students	
Content 5 points	-Introduction is attention-getting and establishes the speaker(s) credibility -Terminology used is appropriate for the audience -Presentation contains accurate material and information -Obvious conclusion summarizing presentation	
Presentation Oral or Visual 5 points	Oral: Speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience Oral: Speaker uses a clear voice, easily heard at the back of the room Visual: Presentation is easily viewed from a distance Oral: Speaker uses proper posture at all times Visual: Presentation is artistically pleasing without being distracting Oral: Good language skills and pronunciation used Other: Good writing skills and punctuation are used Oral: At least one well prepared visual aid is used for support (elec./hard copy) Visual: Presentation identifies creativity (5/extra credit provided) Presentation shows obvious preparation and practices delivery (e.g., tablet use) Length of the presentation is within the assigned time requirement	
Quiz Preparation Required to Receive 15 points	- Quiz is completed with 15 questions clearly stated - Quiz covers the chapter subject matter sufficiently - Hard copies of quiz provided to all students/professor	Included above

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix 2 RUBRIC

Rehab 237

For the following:

Progress Reports/Case Notes; Case Management Documentation; IPE Development and Supportive Narrative Report/Professional Papers – Special Topics

Note: Point Values will be calculated in accordance with each assignment and corresponding rubric values. Also, all assignments valued by this rubric have components that are used to assess the "Graduate Writing Requirement" for this course.

	Exemplary = 5	Accomplished = 4	Acceptable = 3	Developing = 2	Deficient = 1
Synthesis of Knowledge	Student exhibits a comprehensive understanding of the assignment. Reader is able to clearly identify linkages between thoughts. Student's writing is robust/masterly and has included numerous supporting facts, statements, and examples from multiple lenses. Required in-text citations are used.	Student exhibits a strong understanding of the assignment. Reader is able to adequately identify linkages between thoughts. Student's writing is proficient and has included several supporting facts, statements, and examples. Required in-text citations are used.	Student exhibits a basic understanding of the assignment. Reader may have some difficulty in seeing linkages between thoughts. Student's writing is adequate and has included a few supporting facts, statements, and examples. Required in-text citations are used.	Student exhibits a limited understanding of the assignment. Reader is unable to follow the logic used for the development of key themes. Student's writing is weak in the inclusion of supporting facts, statements, and examples. Required in-text citations used.	Student exhibits no understanding of the assignment. Reader is unable to follow the logic used for the development of key themes. Student's writing is poor and unorganized. No and/or incorrect in-text citations are noted.
Foundations of Knowledge	Student exhibits a proficient command of the subject matter. Response offers an impressive level of depth of student's ability to relate course content to practical examples and applications. Student provides comprehensive analysis of details, facts, and concepts in a logical sequence.	Student exhibits above average usage of subject matter. Response provides above average ability in relating course content in examples given. Details and facts presented offer a skillful presentation of student's current level of subject matter knowledge.	Student exhibits a general/fundamental understanding of the subject matter. Response demonstrates adequate ability in relating course content in examples given. Student generally explains concepts, but only meets the minimum requirements in this area.	Student exhibits some understanding of concepts, but overlooks critical details. Response appears vague or incomplete in various segments. Student presents concepts in isolation, and does not perceive to have a logical sequencing of ideas.	Student exhibits no understanding of concepts, thus overlooking critical details. Response is vague, puzzling, and/or incomplete in various segments. Student presents concepts in isolation, and does not perceive to have a logical sequencing of ideas.
Application of Knowledge (Critical Thinking Skills & Critical Reflection Skills)	Student excels in explaining all major points using multiple lenses. An original, unique, and/or imaginative approach to overall ideas, concepts, and findings is presented	Student explains the majority of points and concepts using several lenses. A thoughtful approach to ideas, concepts, and findings is presented.	Student explains several points and concepts using a few lenses. An ordinary/traditional approach to ideas, concepts, and findings is presented.	Student explains some points and concepts using one or two lenses. Attempts to use an approach to ideas, concepts, and findings are presented.	Student attempts to explain some points and concepts. Incorrect or absent lenses appear as part of the response. No attempts made to use any kind of an approach to ideas, concepts and findings is presented.

Appendix 3
Rehab 237
Rehabilitation Plan
Individual Plan for Employment

Criteria	Developing (1) (70-79%)	Capable (2) (80-89%)	Accomplished (3) (90-100%)
Content	The document is missing important consumer information. Supporting documentation or statements are missing. The plan lacks logic, direction, and focus of the consumer goals.	There are 1-2 areas that are incomplete or lacking depth of information. Most information is factual but lacks supporting documentation. Student has a partial understanding of the direction and goals of the plan.	All areas of the assignment are included. All rehabilitation plan domains are documented, addressed in depth, and complete descriptions are provided. The plan flows logically and student has a complete grasp of the goals, purpose, and direction of the plan with supporting documentation.
Grammar & Format	The document contains frequent (3 +) errors in spelling and grammar. Demonstrates little to no sequencing of ideas and is missing and/or limited in depth of content.	There are a few errors (1-2) in spelling and grammar. Organization and content at times lacks clarity or meaning.	No spelling or grammar errors and the plan has been carefully proofed. Sequencing of ideas makes it easy for the reader to follow and understand.
Total score			

Rehab 237: Case Note Rubric

			NOT ACCEPTABLE (0 points)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (3 points)	COMPETENT (4 points)	EXCELLENT (5 points)	Score
	S	Subjective Information	Less than 50% of pertinent information is addressed; or is grossly incomplete and/or inaccurate.	Poorly organized and/or limited accurate summary of pertinent information (50%-80%); information other than "S" provided.	Well organized; partial but accurate summary of pertinent information (>80%).	Complete and concise summary of pertinent information.	
	O	Objective Information	Less than 50% of pertinent information is addressed; or is grossly incomplete and/or inaccurate.	Poorly organized and/or limited summary of pertinent information (50%-80%); information other than "O" provided.	Partial but accurate summary of pertinent information (>80%).	Complete and concise summary of pertinent information.	
	A	Problem Identification and Prioritization	Less than 50% of problems are listed; or main problem missed; or problems not prioritized and/or identified nonexistent problems.	Some problems are identified (50%-80%); incomplete or inappropriate problem prioritization; includes nonexistent problems or extraneous information included.	Most problems are identified and rationally prioritized, including the "main" problem for the case (>80%).	Complete problem list generated and rationally prioritized; no extraneous information or issues listed.	
		Assessment of Current Medical Condition(s) or Drug Therapy-related Problem	Less than 50% of problems include an appropriate assessment.	Assessment is present for 50-80% of problems	An assessment is present for each problem listed but not optimal	An optimal and thorough assessment is present for each problem	
	P	Counseling, Referral, Monitoring & Follow-up	Less than 50% of problems include appropriate counseling, monitoring, referral and/or follow-up plan.	Patient education points, monitoring parameters, follow-up plan and referral plan (where applicable) for a few identified problems (50%-80%).	Patient education points, monitoring parameters, follow-up plan and referral plan (where applicable) for >80% of identified problems.	Specific patient education points, monitoring parameters, follow-up plan and (where applicable) referral plan for each identified problem.	

PRACTICUM EVALUATION

NEW REHAB 238 RUBRICS

Names_____   Date_____

REHAB 238: Case Presentation Rubric

Area to be Evaluated	Evaluation Criteria	Grading Criteria	Your Score
Content in Presentation	•Information presented includes areas outlined in the Case Presentation Guidelines of the syllabus •Trainee is able to effectively attend to diagnoses & rationale, self-care strategies employed, use of evidence-based practices, treatment plan, present outcomes, & related areas in the guide •Quality of questions for peers/university supervisor reflects intentionality	40-36 = Achieved 35-32 = Developing 31-28= Beginning Less than 28 = Limited/Not Addressed	
Professional Approach & Learning Stance	•Ability to demonstrate reflexive practice including ways counselor characteristics might be influencing the therapeutic relationship, course of treatment, and/or outcomes •Ability to utilize peers/instructor for supervision & consultation •Ability to assess one's own progress & limits regarding the case including when to seek supervision/consultation •Ability to answer questions regarding the case & weigh feedback provided for potential implementation •Ability to demonstrate the application of multicultural competence in service delivery of case & during engagement with peers/university supervisor	50-45 = Achieved 44-40 = Developing 39-35 = Beginning Less than 35 = Limited/Not Addressed	
Logistics	•A typed or visual presentation of the information is provided •Ability to demonstrate strong oral communication skills & present content within time allotted	10-9 = Achieved 8 = Developing 7 = Beginning Less than 7 = Limited	
Point Totals		**Total possible= 100 points**	

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

Field Experience Assignment and Evaluations
(Reflection Paper)

	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Practicum Goals	Positives and negatives discussed; changes clearly stated for future.	At least 3 goals are present	At least 2 goals are present	Fewer than 2 goals are present
Tasks completed	Successes and challenges clearly stated.	Self- care is included as a goal	A self- care idea is mentioned	A self- care goal is not present
Supervision Experiences	Evaluation of experiences clearly stated with personal learning included	Most goals are completely measurable	Fewer than half of goals are completely measurable	None of the goals are measurable
Critical Incidents	Discussed in depth with learning included.	Discussed in depth; learning vaguely included.	Cursorily discussed, no learning included.	No discussion of experiences, no learning included
Final Thoughts	Excellent synthesis of Practicum experience.	Good synthesis of Practicum experience	Fair synthesis of Practicum experience.	No synthesis of Practicum experience.
Self-Learning	Clear evidence of reflection.	Some evidence of reflection of total experience	Little evidence of reflection.	No evidence of reflection
Evaluation of Self-Care	Strengths and weaknesses of goals excellently stated; plan for sustainability.	Strengths and weaknesses well stated; good plan for sustainability	Strengths, weaknesses of goals vaguely stately, vague plan for sustainability.	No strengths or weaknesses of goals stated, no plan for sustainability.
Writing Skills	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Writing Style	Thoughts excellently well articulated	Thoughts well articulated.	Thoughts somewhat well articulated.	Thoughts poorly articulated.
Grammar and Spelling	No grammatical and/or spelling errors.	Less than 5 grammatical and/or spelling errors	Less than 10 grammatical and/or spelling errors.	More than 10 grammatical and/or spelling errors.
Length of Paper	Within page limitations			
Timeliness	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Timeliness	Turned in on Time	Turned in 2 or fewer days late	Turned in 4 or fewer days late	Turned in more than 4 days late
Overall Score	Level 4 55 or more	Level 3 44 or more	Level 2 33 or more	Level 1 0 -more

Consumer Counseling Plan Rubric

	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Number of Goals	At least 4 goals are present	At least 3 goals are present	At least 2 goals are present	Fewer than 2 goals are present
Self-Care Inclusion	Self-care is included as a goal	Self-care is included as a goal	A self-care idea is mentioned	A self-care goal is not present
Measurability	All goals are completely measurable	Most goals are completely measurable	Fewer than half of goals are completely measurable	None of the goals are measurable

Writing Skills	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Spelling & Grammar	No spelling or grammatical errors	Fewer than 5 spelling and grammar errors	Fewer than 10 spelling and grammar errors	10 or more spelling and grammar errors
Sentence Structure	Complete sentences throughout	Most sentences are complete	Few complete sentences	No complete sentences
Timeliness	Concepts are excellently articulated and easy to follow	Concepts are well articulated and somewhat easy to follow	Concepts are vaguely articulated and difficult to follow	Concepts are not clear and are extremely difficult to follow

Timeliness	Level 4 5 points	Level 3 4 points	Level 2 3 points	Level 1 0 points
Timeliness	Turned in on Time	Turned in 2 or fewer days late	Turned in 4 or fewer days late	Turned in more than 4 days late

Overall Score	Level 4 35 or more	Level 3 28-34	Level 2 21-27	Level 1 0-20

Taped Counseling Sessions & Transcripts Rubric

Criteria	Level 5 10 points	Level 4 9 points	Level 3 8 points	Level 2 7 points	Level 1 0 points
Skill Labels	Completely Accurate with less than three weak statements with preferred statements.	Completely accurate with more than three weak statements replaced with preferred statements.	Less than three labeling errors with less than three weak statements replaced with preferred statements.	Less than five labeling errors with more than three weak statements replaced with preferred statements.	More than five labeling errors and more than three weak statements replaced with preferred statements.
Microskills	Excellent microskill level demonstrated throughout transcript.	Good microskill level demonstrated throughout transcript.	Average microskill level demonstrated throughout transcript.	Poor microskill level demonstrated throughout transcript.	Unacceptable microskill level demonstrated throughout transcript.
Overall Score	Level 5 20 or more	Level 4 18 or more	Level 3 16 or more	Level 2 14 or more	Level 1 0 more

Self-Care Assessment Worksheet

This assessment tool provides an overview of effective strategies to maintain self-care. After completing the full assessment, choose one item from each area that you will actively work to improve.

Using the scale below, rate the following areas in terms of frequency:

    5 = Frequently
    4 = Occasionally
    3 = Rarely
    2 = Never
    1 = It never occurred to me

Physical Self-Care

____ Eat regularly (e.g. breakfast, lunch and dinner)

____ Eat healthy

____ Exercise

____ Get regular medical care for prevention

____ Get medical care when needed

____ Take time off when needed

____ Get massages

____ Dance, swim, walk, run, play sports, sing, or do some other physical activity that is fun

____ Take time to be sexual—with yourself, with a partner

____ Get enough sleep

____ Wear clothes you like

____ Take vacations

____ Take day trips or mini-vacations

____ Make time away from telephones

____ Other:

Psychological Self-Care

____ Make time for self-reflection

____ Have your own personal psychotherapy

____ Write in a journal

____ Read literature that is unrelated to work

____ Do something at which you are not expert or in charge

____ Decrease stress in your life

_____ Let others know different aspects of you

_____ Notice your inner experience—listen to your thoughts, judgments, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings

_____ Engage your intelligence in a new area, e.g. go to an art museum, history exhibit, sports event, auction, theater performance

_____ Practice receiving from others

_____ Be curious

_____ Say "no" to extra responsibilities sometimes

_____ Other:

Emotional Self-Care

_____ Spend time with others whose company you enjoy

_____ Stay in contact with important people in your life

_____ Give yourself affirmations, praise yourself

_____ Love yourself

_____ Re-read favorite books, re-view favorite movies

_____ Identify comforting activities, objects, people, relationships, places and seek them out

_____ Allow yourself to cry

_____ Find things that make you laugh

_____ Express your outrage in social action, letters and donations, marches, protests

_____ Play with children

_____ Other:

Spiritual Self-Care

_____ Make time for reflection

_____ Spend time with nature

_____ Find a spiritual connection or community

_____ Be open to inspiration

_____ Cherish your optimism and hope

_____ Be aware of nonmaterial aspects of life

_____ Try at times not to be in charge or the expert

_____ Be open to not knowing

_____ Identify what in meaningful to you and notice its place in your life

_____ Meditate

_____ Pray

_____ Sing

_____ Spend time with children

_____ Have experiences of awe

_____ Contribute to causes in which you believe

_____ Read inspirational literature (talks, music, etc.)

_____ Other:

Workplace or Professional Self-Care

_____ Take a break during the workday (e.g. lunch)

_____ Take time to chat with co-workers

_____ Make quiet time to complete tasks

_____ Identify projects or tasks that are exciting and rewarding

_____ Set limits with your clients and colleagues

_____ Balance your caseload so that no one day or part of a day is "too much"

_____ Arrange your work space so it is comfortable and comforting

_____ Get regular supervision or consultation

_____ Negotiate for your needs (benefits, pay raise)

_____ Have a peer support group

_____ Develop a non-trauma area of professional interest

_____ Other:

Balance

_____ Strive for balance within your work-life and workday

_____ Strive for balance among work, family, relationships, play and rest

INTERNSHIP EVALUATION

NEW REHAB 239 RUBRICS

Names_____   Date_____

REHAB 239: Case Presentation or Simulated Staffing Rubric

Area to be Evaluated	*Evaluation Criteria*	*Grading Criteria*	*Your Score*
Content in Presentation	•Information presented includes all 14 areas outlined in the Case Presentation Guidelines of the syllabus •Trainee is able to effectively attend to diagnoses & rationale, self-care strategies employed, use of evidence-based practices, treatment plan, present outcomes, & related areas in the guide •Quality of questions for peers/university supervisor reflects intentionality	40-36 = Achieved 35-32 = Developing 31-28= Beginning Less than 28 = Limited/Not Addressed	
Professional Approach & Learning Stance	•Ability to demonstrate reflexive practice including ways counselor characteristics might be influencing the therapeutic relationship, course of treatment, and/or outcomes •Ability to utilize peers/instructor for supervision & consultation •Ability to assess one's own progress & limits regarding the case including when to seek supervision/consultation •Ability to answer questions regarding the case & weigh feedback provided for potential implementation •Ability to demonstrate the application of multicultural competence in service delivery of case & during engagement with peers/university supervisor	50-45 = Achieved 44-40 = Developing 39-35 = Beginning Less than 35 = Limited/Not Addressed	
Logistics	•A typed or visual presentation of the information is provided •Ability to demonstrate strong oral communication skills & present content within time allotted	10-9 = Achieved 8 = Developing 7 = Beginning Less than 7 = Limited	
Point Totals		**Total possible= 100 points**	

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Names_____   Date_____

REHAB 239: Critical Reflection & Self-Care Wellness Paper Rubric

Areas to be Evaluated	Evaluation Criteria	Grading Criteria	Your Score
Overall Breadth & Depth of Content	•Content covers a wide-range of themes, but dives into specific areas •Information is not only reported, but also analyzed and synthesized •Clear & meaningful connections are made regarding goals in learning contract (e.g., working with diverse populations, diagnosis, treatment planning, advocacy, community resources, evidence-based practices, etc.) •Critical thinking & reflection is evident relative to discussion surrounding self-care assessment and wellness growth and development •Insights are flushed out & discussed •Clear and sophisticated assessment of overall progress is rendered •Areas for future growth are identified & discussed	60-54 = Achieved 53-48 = Developing 47-42 = Beginning Less than 42=Limited/Not Addressed	
Organization & Presentation of Content	•Content is coherently organized so information is easily identifiable •Overall, presentation offers a professional appearance •Transition sentences are used to connect preceding content & areas under discussion	20-18 = Achieved 17-16 = Developing 15-14 = Beginning Less than 14	
Paper Logistics: APA Style/Format, Grammar, & Timeliness	•Paper adheres to APA 6th edition style & format • Paper meets page requirements •Paper is error free relative to grammar/spelling •Paper was submitted on time	20-18 = Achieved 17-16 = Developing 15-14 = Beginning Less than 14	
Point Totals	Total possible= 100 points		

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Names_____   Date_____

REHAB 239: Weekly Summary Rubric

Areas to be Evaluated	Evaluation Criteria	Grading Criteria	Your Score
Overall Breadth & Depth of Content	•Content is explicitly tied to topical theme of the week •Information is not only reported, but also analyzed •Meaningful connections are evident through the demonstration of critical thinking & reflection •Perspectives may also be tied to a global assessment of the internship experience to date	3 = Achieved 2 = Developing 1 = Beginning	
Paper Logistics: Organization, Grammar, & Mechanics	•Content is coherently organized • Paper meets page requirements •Paper is error free relative to grammar/spelling •Paper was submitted on time •Paper is of a professional appearance	2 = Achieved 1 = Beginning	
Point Totals	**Total possible= 5 points**		

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

M. A. in Education - Reading/Language Arts
Dr. Imelda Basurto, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. **What learning outcomes did you assess this 2016-2017 year?**

   a. Outcome 1.1: Graduates will be able to compare and contrast major theories of literacy and language development.
   b. Outcome 1.2: Graduate students will be able to apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons.
   c. Outcome 2.1: Design differentiated instructional strategies based on student assessment results.
   d. Outcome 2.2: Graduate students will be able to provide effective clinical literacy instruction to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse struggling readers.
   e. Outcome 3.1: Graduate students will be able to demonstrate effective collegial mentoring in literacy instruction.
   f. Outcome 3.2: Evaluate school wide and/or district-wide literacy program initiatives.

2. **What instruments did you use to assess them in 2016-2017?**

   a. <u>Assessment 1</u>: Practicum Experience Matrix (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2): LEE 230 (Supervising Small Group Teaching) has primary responsibility for assessing these objectives using the Practicum Experience Matrix. *The LEE 230 Practice Experience Matrix* is a matrix of 18 educational outcomes that have been placed into five competency components: Theoretical Background, Diagnosis and Referral, Instrument Measuring Reading, Prescription, and Methods for Teaching. Of the 18 competency activities listed in the matrix, five are theoretical based, six are diagnosis and referral, two are measuring instruments, two are prescription, and five are teaching materials and methods. For each competency component, students in the course must demonstrate their ability to use research-based methodologies and intervention approaches for beginning readers, English learners and pupils with reading difficulties in a small group intervention format. The outcomes are considered to have been met once all the categorical competencies have been completed.

   b. <u>Assessment 2</u>: Program Evaluation Report (Outcome 3.2): LEE 254 (Supervised Field Experiences in Reading) has the primary responsibility for assessing this objective using *The LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report.* The Program Evaluation Report is a set of evaluation tools combined with school data that is used to construct an evaluation report of a graduate student's school site's literacy program. In these reports, students provide analysis of data regarding school instructional procedures and curriculum materials, the strengths and weaknesses of these elements, and conclusions regarding program enhancement and professional development. Reports are evaluated and scored using evaluation criteria defined as excellent (90-105), fair (63-89), or poor (21-62) based on the ability to collect evaluation data, provide clear analysis that accurately reflects the data,

summarize areas of strength/weakness, and draw conclusions for refinements supported by the research literature. A score of ≥ 80 is considered to have met the learning outcome.

c. <u>Assessment 3:</u> Coaching Presentations (Outcome 3.1): LEE 254 (Supervised Field Experiences in Reading) has the primary responsibility for assessing this objective using *The LEE 254 Coaching Presentation Rubric.* In LEE 254-Supervised Field Experiences in Reading, students collaborate with a colleague in 3 peer-coaching cycles, consisting of pre-consultation, observation/modeling, and debriefing consultation. The students prepare presentations for two of the cycles. Presentations include lessons learned about the coaching process, critical reflective insights about professional growth, and plans for future goals. Presentations are evaluated and scored using evaluation criteria defined as excellent (31-50), fair (11-30), or poor (≤ 10). All scores are based on the student's ability to critically analyze the coaching experiences and to reflectively assess their own professional growth. A score of ≥ 31 is considered to have met the learning outcome

d. <u>Assessment 4</u>: Comprehensive Exam (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1) *LEE 298C Comprehensive Exam* is one of two culminating experience options, and the one most chosen by the graduate students in the program. The Comp Exam assesses learning outcomes connected to the following core courses: LEE 278, LEE 213, LEE 215, LEE 224, and LEE 244. The core course faculty developed ten questions, two questions per course, that assess all outcomes related to that course; however, only five of the questions are used every examination period. The 5 questions are randomly selected by the University's Software Program, Blackboard. Of the five questions selected by Blackboard, the graduate students choose three to answer. Question 1 is for LEE 215, question 2 is for LEE 213, question 3 is for LEE 244, question 4 is for LEE 224, and question 5 is for LEE 278. The learning outcomes of every course are evaluated and scored using a 4 point rubric. A score of ≥ 2.0 is considered to have answered the question correctly.

3. **What did you discover from these 2016-2017 results?**

a. <u>Assessment 1:</u> The Practicum Experience Matrix is a summary of planned experiences in reading instruction as assessed by the Matrix. This matrix evaluated activities at 14 separate school sites for two field experience courses. For data reporting purposes, the 18 competency activities listed on the matrix were consolidated into three broad categories: theoretical background-based activities, assessment-based instructional activities, and materials and methods teaching-based activities. As a result, 23 graduate students successfully completed 5 theoretical-based background activities, 6 assessment-based instructional activities, and 7 materials and methods-based teaching activities, resulting in a 100% passing rate. Note that the scores are based on the number of competencies completed for each area. As a program, it was discovered that graduate students are doing an excellent job in documenting their intervention performance, applying research-based instructional methods, and administering appropriate assessment measures. The program also noted that graduate students feel comfortable in seeking community resources to support their small group intervention programs. While the graduate students are doing well in their practicums, it was noted that perhaps, the program needs to extend its field experience opportunities and incorporate them in a few, if not all the other courses as graduate student claim that there is not enough intervention hours available to them in the semester to complete all the tasks listed on the matrix.

b. <u>Assessment 2</u>: The LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report is evaluated using a rubric consisting of 5 elements: 1) RTI. 2) Literacy Instruction, 3) Instructional Materials, 4) Recommendations, 5) Format. Within each element are specific criteria descriptors used by the Instructor to support the required element expectations. These descriptors are as follows: a) RTI: Tiers, Assessment, Achievement, RTI Analysis; b) Literacy Instruction: Activities, Reading Components, Writing Skills, Instruction Analysis; c) Instructional Materials: Material Use, Technology Resources, Material Analysis: d) Recommendations: Program Elements and Professional Development; and e) Format: Writing Mechanics, and APA Requirements. The elements and the criteria descriptors are evaluated using a 5.0 range: 5 being Excellent, 3 being Fair, and 1 being Poor. The LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report showed that of the ten graduate students. 93% of them achieved a 4.6 in RTI, Literacy Instruction, Instructional Materials, Recommendations, and 95% achieved a 4.78 in Format. As a program, it was discovered that the graduate students are highly capable of conducting a program evaluation; however, they are unable to articulate how there School Site Literacy Program makes a difference in the lives of the children they teach. The program also noted that in a few instances, graduate students do an excellent job of presenting their information; but, are unable to provide a meaningful interpretation, thus breaking a valuable bridge between results and use.

c. <u>Assessment 3</u>: The LEE 254 Coaching Presentation is evaluated using a rubric consisting of three criteria categories: Video Content, Presentation, and Reflective Analysis. These criteria categories are evaluated using a 5.0 range: 5 being Excellent, 3 being Fair, and 1 being Poor. The evaluation results from the LEE 254 Coaching Presentation Rubric showed that of the ten graduate students. 93% of them achieved a 4.64 in Video Content, 85% received a 4.27 in Presentation, and 89% received a 4.45 in Reflective Analysis. As a program, it was discovered that graduate students are able to select content appropriate content for their video, present with minimal ease and are capable of reflecting on their own teaching. However, the program did notice that graduate students were more comfortable in participating in a collaborative reflection rather than an individual one.

d. <u>Assessment 4</u>: The two most popular answered comp exam questions for academic year 2016-2017 were from courses LEE 213 and LEE 244. Of the ten graduate students, 3 students passed Question 1, 7 passed Question 2, 7 passed Question 3, 4 passed Question 4, and 6 passed Question 5 whereas one graduate student did not pass Question 2 and Question 4. Resulting in 28 out 30 questions answered with a 2.0 or above. As a program it was discovered that graduate students are really good at articulating their knowledge of emergent literacy programs (LEE 244). In addition, graduate student understanding of critical literacy (LEE 213), language issues (LEE 215), and literacy theory (LEE 278) was average compared to their understanding of assessment interpretation (LEE 224) which was weak. Table 1 provides the overall rating scores of the 10 graduate students who took the comprehensive examination in the fall of 2016 and the spring of 2017.

Table 1: Fall 2016/Spring 2017 Comprehensive Examination Results

(S) Student	Q-1 215 Scores	Q-2 213 Scores	Q-3 244 Scores	Q-4 224 Scores	Q-5 278 Scores	Total Questions Passed by Student
Fall-S1		1.0		1.0	2.0	1
Fall-S2		3.0	2.0	2.0		3

Fall-S3	2.0			2.0	3.0	3
Fall-S4		3.0	3.0	3.0		3
Fall-S5		3.0	3.0		3.0	3
Fall-S6	2.0	2.0	3.0			3
Spr-S7	3.0	3.0			3.0	3
Spr-S8		3.0	3.0	3.0		3
Spr-S9		3.0	3.0		3.0	3
Spr-S10			3.0	2.0	2.0	3
FA-SPR S1-10	2.3	2.6	3.8	2.2	2.6	28/30

4. What changes did you make as a result of these 2016-2017 findings?

a. At the end of academic year, the Program Coordinator and the faculty began to revamp the Comprehensive Examination Rubric and the Questions. In addition, it was determined that the program needs to be more emphasis on analyzing assessments as this was the comprehensive examination question that had the lowest score. As a result, it will become the responsibility of the LEE 224 faculty to ensure that more emphasis is placed on assessment data analysis rather than on assessment administration

b. The number of intervention hours required for LEE 230 could not be evaluated by the program faculty until next year, as this year the course was taught by an Adjunct.

c. The "lead" LEE 254 course instructor, incorporated a more rigorous interpretive program evaluation segment and increased the number of reflective tasks for individual reflective analysis.

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

a. *LEE 213 Theory to Practice Paper* (Outcomes 1.2, 1.2)
b. *LEE 224 Diagnostic Case Study (*Outcomes 2.1, 2.2*)*
c. *LEE 244 Literature Review* (Outcomes 1.1)
d. *Comprehensive Exam.* (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)

6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?
The Reading/Language Arts Program Faculty continues to execute the Closing the Loop Process outlined in its SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process the data from its signature assignments and program evaluation surveys are changed into information that enables all levels of the program's system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas 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 in 2013-2014 Accreditation Review, and recognized by NCATE and CCTC, our external reviewers. On April 8, 2014, NCATE and CCTC revealed no areas of improvement.

Master of Arts in Special Education
Dr. Kimberly Coy, Coordinator
LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.

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
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.
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.
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 assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity,

survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be "On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the 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 Clear.

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

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

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

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

Social Integration Plan** –In SPED 247, students in the Moderate-Severe credential option complete a project on which they reflect and identify the ways in which they are supporting the development of social relationships and the active integration of a focus child into classroom and

school environments by increasing communication skills. To that end, students complete projects and reflect in three areas: Communication Plan, Communication Matrix, and Picture Exchange Project.

Portfolio – Preparing a portfolio is a formative evaluation method requiring on-going data collection and reflection. During the process of preparing their portfolio, students are required reflect upon the evidence they provide. The portfolio consists of three sections: Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms, materials or artifacts demonstrating and ability to perform as a special education teacher, and the program completion forms. Data collected will be used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes will be made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

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

3. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey – Candidate Form
Due to the latest Program Review for Special Education we are reviewing our survey and dissemination process to be set into motion at the end of this Academic Year
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey - Employer/Administrator Form:
Due to the latest Program Review for Special Education we are reviewing our survey and dissemination process to be set into motion at the end of this Academic Year
Writing Assessment –
SPED 233 analysis Graduate Writing Requirement

Fall 2016 75% pass rate	N= 12	2 did not meet standards	1 did not turn in the paper
Spring 2016 75% pass rate	N=22	4 did not meet standards	2 did not turn in the paper
Spring 2017 92% pass rate	N=25		2 did not turn in the paper

Discussion: Students enter the course with little or no knowledge of APA and writing a review of the literature. The class carefully scaffolds them through practices and support for their ROL.

Research Proposal –

Project Proposal Evaluation Rubric **N = 7**

QUALITY INDICATORS Point Range =	5	4	2-3	0-1
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY o Introduction to the study has a clear statement of the problem, demonstrating how topic is significant to area of study and professional organization. o Introduction situates specific problem within a broader context. o The research questions/ hypothesis are stated clearly. o Assumptions, limitations, and bounds of the study are clearly stated. o Important terms are defined conceptually and operationally.				
Mean Score =	4.14			
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE o Coverage of the literature is adequate and within scope of problem. o Literature review is well organized around major ideas or themes. o The content of the review is drawn from the most relevant published knowledge and current research on the topic under investigation. o Scholarly sources, such as books, peer-reviewed journals, or other materials appropriate to the issue or problem are chosen for study. o There is a literature-based description of the research variables or potential themes and perceptions to be investigated. o The literature review makes explicit connections between prior knowledge and research and the issue or problem under investigation.				
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY o The research design is appropriate and described fully. o The role of the researcher is clearly explained. o The research setting is described and justified. o Population, sample, criteria for selecting sample/participants, and access to subjects/participants are appropriate and described in adequate detail. o The process to generate, gather and record data is explained in detail. o Data gathering methods and procedures are appropriate and clearly described. o The systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (logs, reflective journals, cataloging) are clearly described. o Description of instrumentation or data collection tools is present. o Measures for ethical protections and rights of participants are adequate. o Data analysis methods and procedures are clearly described.				

Mean Score =	3.85				
OVERALL PRESENTATION: STYLE AND FORMAT: APA Style: The proposal must conform to the guidelines for style as set forth in the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA Manual). This includes but is not limited to: o correct grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling. o proper in-text citations for references, direct quotations, and paraphrasing. o the reference list. o all tables and figures. o headings and sub-headings.					
Mean Score =	4.14				
Mean Score =	4.0				
The writing: o is scholarly (i.e., the language is accurate, balanced, specific rather o than overly general, tentative regarding conclusions, grounded in o previous scholarship and evidence). o is direct and precise. o is clear and comprehensible, without excessive jargon. o paragraphs focus on a main point and all sentences within the o paragraph relate to the main point. o transition sentences are used to bridge main ideas.					
Mean Score =	4.14				
The paper: o Is organized logically and comprehensively. o Has headings and subheadings to identify the logic and movement o of the project and make it easy for the reader to follow.					
Mean Score =	4.14				
+= **Overall Mean =**	24.14				

SPED 243 ONLY

☐ *27- 30 points –* **Approved with Commendation, Exceptional Level of Scholarship = A Grade**

☐ *24- 26 points -* **Approved as Written = B Grade**

☐ 21- *23 points –* **Approved with Minor Revisions = C Grade**

☐ 20 *points or less -* **Fail/Requires Revision & Resubmission of Specified**

Categories/Chapter (s)
SPED 243 is a course students take to assist them in preparing for completion of their master's project or thesis. While faculty advise students to take SPED 243 prior to enrollment in project or thesis, some students enroll in both classes at the same time. Five out of seven students enrolled in SPED 243 in Spring 17 were enrolled in the master's project (SPED 298) at the same time. These students were therefore highly motivated to complete both classes in one semester. Data Analysis: The above rubric is completed for each student in SPED 243. Data are collected and analyzed at the end of the semester. Strengths and weaknesses are identified, and a plan for improvement developed.
Strengths: Students typically do a good job introducing their topic and providing a rationale for their project/thesis through a review of literature.
Weaknesses: Even though they have multiple opportunities to write using APA style, they still have difficulty with in text citations. Students have difficulty reporting details of studies they reference in the review of literature. Identifying data analysis procedures continues to be difficult for students.

Intervention Project
Each student met or exceeded expectations and earned at least a 90% on the assignment.

Social Integration Plan –
Students performed well on this assessment. When a review of the evidence-based practices from the literature and course content was conducted, all students (12/12) met the expectations. When interpreting EBPs into practice, all students met expectations, though there were areas for improvement, as these expectations were met, but not at a high level (80-90% for most students). When designing and implementing a plan and collecting data, most students (11/12) met the expectations. Strengths with the outcomes include reviewing EBPs and implementing plans. For the student who did not meet expectations, areas of improvement included applying EBPs and designing a meaningful plan to implement.

Portfolio –
SPED 298: Project in Special Education
Spring 2017

Course Objectives: Criteria for Thesis/Project: No academic distinction is made between a thesis and a project. Either one is equally acceptable as a means of fulfilling the requirements for the graduate degree. Specific departmental instructions or requirements should, however, be ascertained by the candidate before enrollment in courses 298 or 299. The instructor of record for thesis or project must issue a letter grade on the Graduate Degree Clearance form through the Division of Graduate Studies.
Whether a student is preparing a thesis or a project, it should be noted that quality of work accomplished is a major consideration in judging acceptability. The finished project/thesis must evidence originality, appropriate organization, clarity of purpose, critical analysis, and accuracy and completeness of documentation where needed.
Critical and independent thinking should characterize every project/thesis. Mere description, cataloging, compilation, and other superficial procedures are not adequate.
The quality of writing, format, and documentation must meet standards appropriate for publication in the scholarly journals of the field, or be consistent with the dictates of an authorized stylebook.

During Spring 2017, I had six project students. Each student met with me individually and in small groups for guidance regarding formatting, data collection and analyses, and to maintain writing schedules to meet deadlines.

All students completed projects for this course within deadlines, and all project students earn the letter grade of "A". Each project met the following criteria for receiving a letter grade of "A":

- Each projected followed guidelines set forth in APA, 6th Edition.
- The problem and purpose of each project were clearly stated.
- Each project contained a well-structured review of relevant literature.
- Each project contained a research design that was clear and appropriate for the problem being investigated.
- Each project contained a discussion regarding key findings, recommendations, and conclusions, as well as limitations of each project (which included research design, participants, and instruments). Additionally, each project contained implications for future research as well as for practice and policy.
- Each project connected results to current and past research pertaining to the project.

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

Data

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

4 = exceptional evidence/application]

Target is scores of 3 and 4.

SPED 235/236	N =	Reflection	Critical Thinking	Professional Ethics	Valuing Diversity	Collaboration	Life-Long Learning
Spring 2016	8	3.61	3.45	3.90	3.63	3.34	3.61
Fall 2016	18	3.50	3.52	3.84	3.51	3.47	3.62
Spring 2017	7	3.75	3.6	3.9	3.73	3.81	3.89

1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey – Candidate Form
Due to the latest Program Review for Special Education we are reviewing our survey and dissemination process to be set into motion at the end of this Academic Year. Changes we expect include how the surveys are distributed for a more robust sample return.

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey - Employer/Administrator Form:
Due to the latest Program Review for Special Education we are reviewing our survey and dissemination process to be set into motion at the end of this Academic Year. Changes we expect include how the surveys are distributed for a more robust sample return.

Writing Assessment –
A change was made between 2016 and 2017, which may be evidenced in the increased pass rate. Prior to 2017 the ROL assignment was scaffold across three assignments:
Abstract and Page 1/Intro; First 5 pages and References to date; and final ROL but 150 points were only given at the end. In 2017 we made three distinct assignments with Abstract and Page 1/Intro 20 points; First 5 pages and References to date 30 points; and final ROL 100 points. This seemed to encourage the students to not procrastinate and allowed input and rewrites prior to the final paper.
In 2016 students were given the opportunity for a 1:1 appointment with the faculty during class time on one class day to provide more individual support.

Writing Assessment –
Changes made Fall 17:
In-class activities have been implemented to help students identify and correct common in text citation and reference errors. Much time has is spent modeling and providing practice activities for students to give more detail when reporting studies in the review of literature. The Division of Research and Graduate Studies offers opportunities for graduate students to access the Writing Studio and Statistics Studio to help them with many aspects of their project/thesis. In addition to these changes, instructors are scheduling individual appointments with students to review their progress, make recommendations, and provide overall support for their work.

Intervention Project-
No changes were made as a result of the data. The assignment continues to be relevant to the development of special education teachers.

Social Integration Plan –
After reviewing assessment data related to interpreting EBPs into meaningful, practice-based steps and noting this as an area of need, students completed in-class activities in which some EBPs were modeled. A sample implementation plan was shared in class. Students then worked in pairs or small groups to discuss plans and design steps. These were reviewed at the end of class prior to implementation and data collection. Those students who needed additional support met with the instructor individually or in pairs to discuss how to apply EBPs and design an effective plan.

Portfolio –
Group writing sessions were added to facilitate completion of IRB forms, trouble shooting data collection, and discussing data interpretation, and issues with APA style. This change was made based on issues that emerged during Spring 2016 where students demonstrated a need for greater support for their writing and project completion. During Spring 2017, students attended regular bimonthly writing sessions (each lasting approximately two hours) where they had opportunities to discuss issues with their writing, data displays and interpretations of data, and formatting of

their projects. These sessions also provided motivation for completing their projects within deadlines.

Based on the results of this change, group writing sessions (bimonthly or more, depending on student need and performance) should continue during Spring 2018 SPED 298 courses.

Candidate Dispositions –
No program changes made based on data.

1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

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
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.
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.
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 progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?**
   Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state "no progress."
   "no progress" (Program review recently completed, new measures in place for this academic school year.)

Additional Guidelines: If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.

M. A. in Education - Early Childhood Education
Dr. Cathy K. Yun, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. The G.E. Committee will issue a separate call for G.E. assessment reports.

Goal 1: ECE graduates utilize theory, research, and ongoing assessment when making instructional decisions.
SLO 1.1. Demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions that promote development and learning.
SLO 1.2. Apply current ECE research to issues of practice.
SLO 1.3. Utilize a variety of inquiry methods and the latest technology.

Goal 2: ECE graduates are caring and ethical teacher-leaders, guided by their knowledge of culturally and developmentally appropriate practices.
SLO 2.1. Engage in reflection, documentation, self-assessment and life-long learning.

Goal 3: ECE graduates are leaders who address the needs of their culturally diverse learners respectfully and responsively.
SLO 3.1. Integrate various perspectives to create quality early education for all children.
SLO 3.2. Be responsive to ethnical, cultural and linguistic diversity.

Goal 4: Develop inter-professional skills necessary to become ECE leaders in both the educational community and in the community at large.
SLO 4.1. Build strong relationships with families and communities.
SLO 4.2. Advocate for children, families, and the profession.

2. **What instruments (assignment) did you use to assess them?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the instrument (assignment) is able to measure the outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be "On outcome 2.3

Six assessments were used to evaluate student performance relative to the four goals:
*   **Link to Assessment 1 & Rubric**: Project/Thesis or Comprehensive Exam evaluated **Goal 1**

All of the options for Assessment 1 (i.e., Comprehensive Examination, Project, Thesis, Specialist Research Paper) require a theoretical framing and demonstration of the candidate's understanding of theory and research regarding young children's characteristics and needs, from birth through age 8. In addition, candidates must be able to discuss the multiple influences on early development and learning, including diverse family and community characteristics. Candidates must demonstrate the ability to use research-based concepts and appropriate inquiry tools related to content areas, academic disciplines, development, and/or the early childhood field to craft and provide evidence for a coherent argument or stance. **The 2016 Comprehensive Exam prompts and rubrics can be accessed here**.

- **Link to Assessment 2 & Rubric**: Field Portfolio evaluated **Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4**
The ECE Field Portfolio assessment requires students to document and organize the cumulative evidence of their ability to apply as NAEYC's Standards and Key Elements in order to demonstrate growth as an ECE professional in their identified specialization: Teacher Leader or Program Leader. Students are directed to include evidence from ECE graduate studies, fieldwork, and professional experiences. In doing so, students address the NAEYC Advanced Standards and Key Elements. The scope of this assessment is intentionally broad in order to scaffold students' learning and accountability to a level of synthesis. Students must "put it all together," in order to make the necessary connections between seemingly discrete curricula and experiences.

- **Link to Assessment 3 & Rubric**: Charter School Project evaluated **Goals 1 and 3**
The DAP Charter School Project makes real the ideals of developmentally and culturally appropriate practices (DAP) and a quality, comprehensive ECE program spanning birth through third grade. Candidates design a curriculum and assessment plan for a charter school, based in research-based, developmentally appropriate practices. In their plans, candidates must demonstrate cultural competence and effective collaboration to involve families and communities in young children's development and learning.

- **Link to Assessment 4 & Rubric**: Leadership Activity evaluated **Goal 4**
The ECE Leadership Activity requires students to design a community-based activity to enhance ECE quality based in their ECE practice. This activity is a critical demonstration of the candidate's ability to provide effective professional leadership grounded in research and best practice, and to be an advocate for children and families.

- **Link to Assessment 5 & Rubric**: Action Research Activity evaluated **Goal 1**
The Action Research Project provides students the opportunity to engage in reflective practice by exploring an action research question through application of theory, a review of the literature, and approved action research methodology. The project includes development of an assessment plan, implementation of an evidence-based practice, and connection of assessment and practice to theory.

- **Link to Assessment 6 & Rubric**: Dispositions and Ethics Activity evaluated **Goals 2, 3, and 4**
The Dispositions and Ethics Assignment requires students to analyze and respond to a series of ECE case studies with regard to developmentally appropriate practices, culturally sustaining

pedagogy and practices, and professional and ethical conduct. Candidates are required to incorporate references to the NAEYC *Code of Ethical Conduct*.

3. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

Relative to Goal 1, there were mixed assessment results. Analysis of the Action Research Project (Assessment 5) indicates a relative strength for all students in their ability to utilize a variety of inquiry methods as well as competency in their ability to apply theory and current research to issues of practice (n = 6, *M* = 23.67/24, min = 23/24, max = 24/24). Over the last two years, the mean scores on Assessment 5 have increased from 20.17 to 23.67. The five students for whom we have Project/Thesis/Comprehensive Exam (Assessment 1) data at this time demonstrated at an adequate level their ability to apply current research to issues of practice (n = 5, *M* = 9.6/12, min = 8/12, max = 12/12.

Relative to Goal 2, 2016-17 data for the Field Portfolio (Assessment 2) and the Dispositions and Ethics Activity (Assessment 6) were unavailable.

Relative to Goal 3, the 2016-17 data for the Portfolio (Assessment 2) were unavailable. ECE students were 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 on the Charter School project (Assessment 3) (n = 20, *M* = 12.95/15, min = 11/15, max = 15/15). All students scored higher than a 2 (minimum passing) in at least one of the NAEYC standard-aligned rubric areas.

Relative to Goal 4, students' performances were adequate in the areas of leadership as measured by the Leadership Activity (Assessment 4) (n = 20, *M* = 12.9/15, min = 11/15, max = 15/15). 2016-17 data for the Portfolio (Assessment 2) and the Dispositions and Ethics Activity (Assessment 6) were unavailable.

4. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

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

- Goal 1: In 2016-17, we piloted a new format for our ECE Comprehensive Exam (Assessment 1). All prompts for 2016-17 were collaboratively constructed based on our repository of previous prompts. Revision of prompts, alignment of prompts to NAEYC standards and SOAPs, and system for prompt selection/rotation were postponed to the 2017-18 AY because we felt that it was a higher priority to change the existing format. Prior to 2016-17, the Comp Exam was a face-to-face 6-hour testing Saturday. Students received five prompts at the beginning of the semester and had about one month to gather

resources and study for those prompts. On the day of the exam, students were required to respond to the four out of five prompts that were selected for that exam sitting. These four prompts were usually selected by the exam administrator. In 2016-17 we changed the format so that students received a study guide at the beginning of the semester; rather than giving students specific prompts for which to study, the study guide consisted of broad topics related to the prompts that the faculty co-constructed. About one month into the semester, the Comp Exam was released on a certain day; students had 10 days to complete the exam and submit it. They were allowed to use any resources as long as they cited them. The students responded very well to this new format. They reported experiencing less anxiety and higher self-efficacy in completing the exam. In 2017-18, the faculty will work toward updating our repository of prompts and aligning them to standards and SOAPs.

- Goal 2: The Portfolio Assessment (Assessment 2) is used to evaluate this goal. Currently, we are in discussions about revising this assessment so that it documents change and growth over the course of the program, rather than current practices only.
- Goal 3: The revised Charter School Project (Assessment 3) and rubric were piloted in 2015-16. 2016-17 plans included examination of the pilot data and discussion of whether the assessment and/or rubric needs to be further refined. However, as a team, we were not able to accomplish this task. This year, we plan on examining Assessment 3 and its accompanying data.
- Goal 4: In 2017-18 the Leadership Assessment (Assessment 4) will be revised, along with the course in which it is embedded. The course and assessment are missing the topic of advocacy in ECE and documentation of advocacy activities. The course and assessment are also missing connections to policy, which will also be addressed in the revision.

5. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.

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

6. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state "no progress."
   The most significant change in 2016-17 was the format of the Comp Exam (see Item 4) which was positively received by the students. In addition to the Comp Exam, we piloted a new format for projects as well. Rather than a traditional five chapter writeup, we gave students the option to produce a manuscript of publishable quality that would be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. Although no students chose this format in 2016-17, we will continue to offer this option and encourage particular students to pursue this opportunity in

2017-18. This year (2017-18) Assessment 4 (Leadership) will be revised, along with the course content. Assessment 5 (Action Research) will also be revised to include a stronger family/caregiver component, based on a pattern of lower scores on the standard dealing with family connections (NAEYC 6d).

Additional Guidelines: If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please attach a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.

M. A. in Education - Multilingual and Multicultural Education
Dr. Teresa Huerta, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Multilingual and Multicultural Education Program (MME) has five major goals in its programs, which are listed in the SOAP as Goals A-E. This new program recently began in Spring 2014 and the courses that have been taught (LEE 281, LEE 282, LEE 283, LEE 284 and LEE 298).

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

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

7. Students identified multiple teaching methods for addressing the needs of speakers of other languages in schools, community, or business settings.
Outcome: Students submitted a final research paper that focus on the role of parental involvement or external business partnerships within linguistically and culturally diverse communities and demonstrated culturally responsive practices in teaching LCD learners
Outcome: Explication of knowledge of historical trends providing a critical analysis on the theoretical foundations that reflect the diverse populations that educators work within K-16 school settings.
Outcome: Analysis, comparison of effective and productive leadership models that incorporate moral, ethical, socio-cultural and social justice perspectives.
Outcome: Reflections that illustrate a diverse learner's viewpoint on present-day educational issue. Analysis and explication of global competencies within the context of educational leadership.
Outcome: Formulation and definition of guiding principles of leadership (i.e. innovation, authority, management, and vision).

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

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

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

A. Develop expertise and practical skills in designing, planning, implementing critical pedagogy in multilingual and cross-cultural programs through courses in first and second language acquisition theory, and responsive methodologies in bilingual, dual language, and English language development (ELD).
B. Provide educators with an advanced level of inquiry, research, and professional preparation with regards to cultural and linguistic learners.
C. Prepare instructional leaders who are cognizant of the challenging issues and rights faced by linguistically and culturally diverse learners in Pk-16 educational settings by considering moral, ethical and social justice perspectives.
D. Prepare scholars, teachers, resource specialists, and administrators in academic institutions, public schools, and federal and state agencies for careers in culturally and linguistically diverse settings.
E. Gain an understanding of the role of leadership within the context of global education systems as viewed and experienced by linguistically and culturally diverse communities. The matrix, on the following page, demonstrates how each of the above stated program goals are aligned with the student learning outcomes as measured in each of the specific program core courses for the option in Multilingual Multicultural Education. For more details of each of the learning outcomes course syllabi can be referenced. The graduate students completing this course of study will have the option to enroll in a final project assignment (LEE 298) or a comprehensive exam plus 3 units of an approved elective.

Program Student Outcomes as Measured by Course Matrix

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

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

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

These instruments are requirements for LEE 281, LEE 283 course in order to assess student outcomes:
- Assessment 1: Reflection Papers evaluated Objective A-1.
- Assessment 2: Case Study evaluated Objective A-2.
- Assessment 3: Action Research Activity evaluated both Objective A -1 and A2.

Reviews of the Literature: MME graduates demonstrated their ability to research by completing a review of the literature (SOAP Goal). A criterion rubric was used to evaluate the quality of the work completed by the student. Rubric summations were compiled and shared with the faculty. A rubric used to score the project or comprehensive exam. In addition, random

projects were selected and reviewed every academic year by the entire faculty. The data was summarized and used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

Learning Outcome Rubric

	1. Insufficient	2. Emerging	3. Developed	4. Highly Developed
Alignment of SOAP, outcomes, measures, and rubrics (if a rubric was used)	Outcomes are unclear or cannot be measured. The outcomes, measures (assignments) and rubrics (if used) are not aligned.	At least some of the outcomes are clearly stated and can be measured. The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are related to some extent but do not correspond to the degree that they need to do so.	The outcomes are all clearly stated and can be measured using indirect and direct evidence. The outcomes, measures, and rubric are aligned to a considerable extent.	All outcomes are clear and detailed and can be measured in multiple ways. The outcomes, measures, and rubric all focus on exactly the same skills or aspects of learning and are thus aligned and all are stated using terms that are clear
Evidence and Discovery from Data	The measure/assignment does not have clear directions and/or does not provide enough information to evaluate if a learning outcome was met. A very small and insufficiently diverse sample of student work was used. The results are not clearly described or are just listed in a simplistic way.	The assignment is clearly stated and provides information related to a learning outcome that can be evaluated. The sample includes a minimum of ten examples of student work and the sample is random/diverse. The results are described but not in enough detail.	The assignment is clearly stated and provides considerable information that can be used to evaluate whether or not a learning outcome was met. The sample includes at least fifteen examples of student work and is sufficiently random/diverse. The results are described in detail and specific examples are given.	The assignment has clear and detailed instructions and the student work provides considerable amount of information directly related to a learning outcome. At least twenty samples of student work are reviewed and the sample is random and very diverse. The results are described in detail with both patterns and anomalies in the results clearly indicated.
Consideration of and use of results	Assessment review is not in-depth and no review of the results is conducted after they are included in an initial report. The results are not reviewed or discussed by more than one or two faculty members. No real conclusions are drawn and no attempt is made to consider the program in light of the assessment data.	Assessment review is in some depth and the results are discussed by multiple faculty. Some conclusions are drawn based on the report and these conclusions are discussed in relation to the program.	Assessment review is enough depth and the evaluation of student work is conducted by and discussed by multiple faculty several times. Conclusions are drawn based on the results and these conclusions are used to either confirm that students are meeting the	Assessment is conducted in depth and results from multiple years are discussed by the faculty. Conclusions are drawn and are used to identify and strengths and weaknesses of the program and to consider whether or not changes to the program should be made.

			learning outcomes or to discuss potential changes.	
Overall Engagement in Assessment	Very little assessment activity is reported. Outcomes, measures, and rubrics are not aligned and/or assessment data is not evaluated or used to decide if changes should be made to program.	Some assessment activity is reported but there are issues with alignment. It is not clear that assessment results are considered or used to evaluate program and decide if changes should be made.	Continuous assessment activity carried out. The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are aligned and the assessment data is utilized to evaluate the program in terms of strengths, weaknesses, and whether or not any changes should be made.	Continuous and well-planned assessment is carried out The outcomes, measures, and rubrics are very closely aligned and the results are frequently reviewed and used to evaluate the program in terms of strengths, weaknesses, and potential changes to the program.

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

Writing Requirement

As one of the requirements for LEE 282, each student will identify various developmental issues related to the development of concepts in young children, locate and read related literature, and write a formal analysis 5-8 pages in length reviewing the concept and drawing conclusions about the issue. The student's writing should 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.

Faculty Evaluation of Writing Proficiency

The instructor of LEE 282 will be 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 will be considered completed. For each section of LEE 282, the instructor will forward to the program coordinator a list of students enrolled and the status of

their writing competence. The program coordinator will forward this information to the School of Education graduate chair and the Graduate Studies Office. A record of each student's writing proficiency status will be placed in the student's file.

If the instructor believes the student's writing to be deficient in one or more areas, it will be referred to the Review Committee and evaluated by the committee as a whole. The Review Committee will consist of 2 graduate faculty in addition to the instructor. The decision of this committee will be considered final. If the committee determines that the student meets the criteria, the process will be considered completed and the chair of the committee will 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 will be required to remediate writing skills. The appropriate methods for remediation will be determined in conjunction with the Review Committee and monitored by the student's Graduate Advisor.   Remediation may require (but not be limited to) additional course work, experiences in the Writing Center, tutoring and/or independent study. Following remediation, the student will submit a letter to the Graduate Advisor outlining the steps taken to improve writing proficiency and requesting that s/he be allowed to redo the writing assessment. With the concurrence of the advisor, the student will be allowed to redo the writing assignment on a different topic. The subsequent writing sample will be evaluated by the Review Committee and the decision of the committee will be considered final.

Writing Outcome Rubric

Scoring Level	Style and Format	Mechanics	Content and Organization
4 - Exemplary	In addition to meeting the requirement for a "3," the paper is consistent with APA throughout. Models the language and conventions used in related scholarly/professional literature. Would meet the guidelines for an APA publication.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," the paper is essentially error free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions help establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.	In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," excels in the organization and presentation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.
3 - Accomplished	While there may be minor errors, APA conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring	While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not interfere significantly with comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures such as subheadings are used which help the reader move from one point to another.	Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is timely and carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the

	back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. Models the discipline's overall journalistic style.		reader's attention. Does a creditable job summarizing related literature.
2 - Developing	While some APA conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; lacks appropriate transitions.	While the paper represents the major requirement, it is lacking is substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.
1 - Beginning	APA conventions are not followed. Fails to demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation. Lack of appropriate style and format make reading and comprehensibility problematic.	Paper contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and/or sentence structure which make following the logic of the paper extremely difficult	Analysis of existing scholarly/professional literature on the topic is inadequate. Content is poorly focused and lacks organization. The reader is left with little understanding of the topic.

3. What did you discover from these results?

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

Assessment 1 – Reflection papers were evaluated with 4 criteria: descriptive, personal, critical, and creative. The reflection was also to include a visual element, a quotation and a response to the quotation. Reflection Papers indicated relative strengths for all students in their ability to explain critical pedagogy. Six students (n=6) scored 5 points out a possible of 5 points for every one of the reflections they attempted with one student missing two attempts. The range was 5.0 to 5.0 and the mean was 5.0 for all attempts. The reflections were all very good and formed the basis for discussion in our seminar.

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

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

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

Changes in assessment instruments, such as rubrics, and in the curriculum, have been made to further capture **strengthen or weakness** in students' performances relative to each of the Outcomes in Goal A- E for 2016-17. Since the reflection papers turned out to be so good and revealing, we increased the number of reflection papers from 5 per semester for LEE 283 to 10 per semester. We will also develop a rubric that reflects the criteria. As we teach more courses and more students, we will examine the trends to determine more modifications to the program.

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

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-18 academic year?

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

The MME candidates will participate in a discussion forum and debate on major contemporary issues concerning LCD students. The MM candidates will acquire meta-note skills; produce two case studies, two final presentation/research papers. In addition, MME graduate students will produce either a scholarship piece of work (typically 4-5 characters in length and conforming to the University requirements for a thesis in writing style and format) or take a comprehensive exam.

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

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

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

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

The first, second and third cohorts of the MME graduated from the program in spring 2015 and 2016. The students successfully completed their projects on their selected topics and continued on with their jobs, one student entered a doctoral program at UC San Diego and was also the Kremen Dean's medalist as well as the University, graduate dean's medalist. The MME Cohort IV will be graduating in the spring 2018.

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 have connected with local professional organizations, such as the Association of Mexican American Educators, AMAE, the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), the Central California World Language Program (CCWLP), and the Central California Dual Langue Consortium to advertise and recruit. We have created a video for the purpose of advertising and recruitment of the MME Program on social media such as the KSOEHD website and facebook and Youtube). We continue to offer courses at hours when teachers can attend (4-7 p.m., 7-10 p.m., during the summer, on weekends) and at locations convenient for many. We are planning to establish graduate cohort in Visalia (Visalia Unified School Districts and hopefully Chowchilla as well).

Liberal Studies
Dr. Frederick Nelson, Coordinator

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Liberal Studies is in transition. In the summer of 2015 faculty who teach upper-division courses in the program collaborated with local K-8 partner teachers in a two-week professional development academy. The purpose of this experience was to reform courses to better prepare future elementary teachers in relevant content and pedagogy, given the influences of Common Core State Standards, teacher shortages, the needs of a diverse population of learners, and the changing nature of the teaching context. In the academy, faculty and teachers used the themes of Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy, Universal Design for Learning, and Social Justice as unifying structures for the reformed program. In the spring of 2016, thirty LS juniors participated as a cohort in four courses that emphasized these themes. A new group of faculty participated in Liberal Studies Summer Academies in 2016 and 2017, and the cohort scheduling model was expanded to four new cohorts in fall 2016. During this time of transition, Dr. Susan Schlievert acted as the program coordinator, and Dr. Dr. Frederick Peinado Nelson managed the new cohort schedule and faculty collaboration and professional development activities. In the spring of 2017, a submission to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) was prepared to demonstrate alignment with the new Elementary Subject Matter content specifications. In addition to these changes to the curriculum and structure of the program, Liberal Studies was formally established as an academic department in the Kremen school in fall 2017, with Dr. Frederick Peinado Nelson as the chair. Due to these changes, no program assessment data was collected in 2016-17.

1. What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?
In 2013 the Liberal Studies Review Committee (LSRC) identified these four goals and learning outcomes in the SOAP for years 2013-2016:
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.

The SOAP will be revised in 2017-18 to account for changes in program coursework and compliance with curriculum specified by the CTC Program Preconditions, Standards, and the Elementary Subject Matter content specifications.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?
These Assessment Methods were identified in the 2013 SOAP:
Direct Measures

A. Course Assignments (w/scoring rubrics)
B. California Subjects Examination for Teachers (CSET) (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

These measures are in need to review for relevance and utility in program assessment. When we receive approval of our Elementary Subject Matter application from the CTC, we will determine appropriate course assignments that inform program assessment. When that application is approved, LS students will no longer be required to pass the CSET in order to enter the Multiple Subject teaching credential program. That data is of limited value for program assessment, as it is not available from the testing company and is only self-reported by students when they pass the subtests. The portfolio is either unspecified or ambiguous in course syllabi. The exit survey was not administered, as it is also in need of revision to capture meaningful data reflecting program innovations such as the cohort schedule and enhanced field experiences. Course evaluation (instructor evaluations) information is not available Liberal Studies Department from other departments across campus.

3. What did you discover from these data?
In the process of alignment of coursework to the Elementary Subject Matter content specifications, we determined the need for improved consistency in LS coursework, particularly in lower-division courses.

4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?
We are in the process of identifying specific courses that need more explicit identification of learning experiences that align to the Elementary Subject Matter content specifications. Some courses may need to be eliminated from the program, and some new coursework may need to be designed to satisfy the new content specifications.

5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-18 academic year?
We will be engaging in a complete revision of the SOAP, based on the many curricular, programmatic, and pedagogical changes in the program:
1. Establishment of relevant Goals and Student Learning Outcomes
2. Current Curriculum Map (adapted from the CTC Elementary Subject Matter alignment matrix)
3. Identification of appropriate, aligned Assessment Methods
4. Communication to all involved faculty of their responsibilities for data collection and submission as identified in the revised Liberal Studies Assessment Methods Matrix
5. Development of a new Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Methods and Summary Evaluations

These activities will require extensive effort from many faculty members, beginning with the planning and coordination of the Liberal Studies Review Committee. The LS department faculty and faculty from across the university who teach LS courses will need to contribute to this plan.

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

The action plan from the previous program review was not available. Last year's Assessment Report did not identify areas for action. From the 2016 report:
"While each outcome is discussed annually, the emphasis and formal assessment for 2016-2017 will be determined by analysis of survey assessment questionnaires in SSCI 180, SOC 11, and LING32. We will continue to examine and monitor results from the California Subjects Examination for Teachers (CSET) to determine the level of content preparation for teachers." Data from the survey assessment questionnaire was not made available. CSET data is not available.

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
Dr. Ken Magdaleno, Director

<h1 style="text-align:center">LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT</h1>

1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.

SLO: 1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity.
SLO: 2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and design potential solutions.
SLO: 3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader.
SLO: 4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success.

2. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be "On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric."

The DPELFS uses multiple direct and indirect measures to gauge students and program outcomes.

<u>SLO: 1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity</u>.
Dissertation Criteria and Oral and Written Rubric– The dissertation is normally a study exploring the application of practice to an educational issue or problem. The instrument used to assess student outcomes is the Dissertation Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations. Each student is provided with a copy of the Criteria when they begin work on their dissertation. The instrument is used by the faculty during the oral defense to evaluate the work included in the dissertation. This instrument is used both to complete the dissertation rubric, which is aligned with the Criteria document, and to give to the student as feedback on the quality of their work. At the end of each cohort program, these dissertation rubrics are collected for all students who completed their dissertations and reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment subcommittee of the doctoral faculty Graduate Group.

SLO: 2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and design potential solutions.

Embedded Fieldwork Assessment – In six out of the nine core courses there is a component of embedded fieldwork or "laboratories of practice" where collaborative groups of doctoral students work with school site and college-based leaders to complete a project for that client directly related to the course curriculum. Clients are given the Embedded Fieldwork Assessment to complete at the end of the course and when the project has been completed. This instrument provides feedback about how well the students were able to undertake and complete work directly related to the course (student outcomes assessment). These assessments are collected at the end of a cohort's program of study and reviewed by the Assessment subcommittee of the doctoral faculty Graduate Group to assess the degree to which program outcomes are being met.

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

360 Pre and Post Disposition Survey– this assessment is distributed to students at the beginning of the program and again at the end of the program. Students complete it as a "self-assessment", and it is also distributed to seven other individuals with whom the individual works (one must be their supervisor). The data is summarized and the combined means of the other assessors are given to the student with their own assessments so they can compare to see if their views are consistent (or inconsistent) with others who have assessed them. The assessment is also taken at the end of the program and the data from the pre and post surveys for self and others is compared to see what growth has been realized during the program. The assessment is used to measure individual's leadership dispositions related to students, community and the Kremen School of Education and Human Development adopted dispositions.

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

Qualifying Examination and Rubric – The Qualifying Examination is a problem-based scenario that is administered after students complete the Core sequence of courses. The exam is administered in a four-hour block and is meant to see how well students are able to apply the course content to real issues and problems in their educational arenas. A question is submitted by each Core course faculty member along with a rubric that is designed to identify what is and is not an appropriate response to each question. Core course faculty are provided with a sample rubric to follow as they design their individual question rubric.

3. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).

SLO: 1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity.

During the 2016-17 academic year 80% of dissertations focused on issues of equity and social justice. These dissertations varied in topics from focusing on students in high poverty schools to resilient doctoral students who faced childhood challenges. We also discovered that the Dissertation Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations has not been used for some time. The Oral and Written Rubrics are the only evaluation criteria for dissertations. DPELFS plans on updating the SOAP to reflect our current practice during the 2017-18 academic year.

SLO: 2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and design potential solution

Embedded fieldwork is a DPELFS signature pedagogy and is ingrained in 6 out of our 9 core courses. Therefore, students complete 6 projects where they evaluate real world problems of practice in existing organizations. Data produced from the Embedded Fieldwork assessment shows clients are extremely satisfied with work done by the doctoral students. However in one of the groups clients noted that students can work more on professionalism i.e adhering to time constraints and being on time.

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

The 360 Pre and Post Disposition Survey is distributed to students at the beginning of the program and again at the end of the program. Program facilitators found that many students were not submitting end of program surveys by mail and determined that the survey should be administered in electronic form. The assessment was recently converted from paper to an online survey. The 2016-17 cohort was the first to take the online version; data will be analyzed after they graduate in 2019.

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

6 out of 12 or 50% of DPELFS students who sat for the qualifying exam passed within the first attempt. The remaining 6 who had to retake a section of the exam passed during their second attempt.

4. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.

- The Center for Research Action and Social Justice has been established to support students who are working on fieldwork projects or dissertations that focus on equity and social justice. Even though 80% of our dissertations have this focus DPELFS would like to increase the amount of students who focus on equity issues, especially when it comes to the dissertation.
- All faculty who teach courses with embedded fieldwork go over professionalism in their classroom to ensure that students understand the importance of maintaining a professional environment while working out in the field.

- The qualifying exam has been modified to increase rigor and ensure that students review all 9 core courses after completing the first half of the doctoral program. Beginning with the 2017-2018 academic year students will not be given questions ahead of time. Instead students will be studying 9 study guides that they will be receiving from each core course and be provided 3 questions the day of the exam.

5. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-2018 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.
- *Embedded Fieldwork Assessment*
- *Qualifying Examination and Rubric*
- *Oral and Written Rubric*
- *360 Pre and Post Disposition Survey*
- *Annual Student Evaluation*
- *Graduate Survey*
- *Alumni Survey and Resume Content Review – 1 year after graduation.*
- *Alumni Survey and Resume Content Review – 5 years after graduation*

6. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state "no progress."
- DPELFS has recently revitalized its alumni chapter in order to gain access to all past alumni and increase the number of alumni who respond to the alumni surveys.
- DPELFS has revamped all subcommittees including the fieldwork subcommittee
- Client fieldwork surveys have been redeveloped to more closely align with student learning outcomes and program outcomes and include a semi-structured interview component.
- Restructuring of Center for Research and Publication to the Center for Research Action and Social Justice to align more with student needs.

Additional Guidelines: If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions.

Please see attached dissertation rubrics

DPELFS Written Dissertation Rubric

Preliminary Defense

		1	2	3	4	5	Score
1	*Introduction*	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear. Was not comprehensive.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear. Was not comprehensive.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Was not comprehensive.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was comprehensive.	
2	*Review of Literature*	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/ exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was comprehensive.	
3	*Methods / Approach*	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was comprehensive.	

Comment:

DPELFS Written Dissertation Rubric
Final Defense

		1	2	3	4	5	Score
1	*Introduction*	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear. Was not comprehensive.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear. Was not comprehensive.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Was not comprehensive.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Was comprehensive.	
2	*Review of Literature*	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was not comprehensive.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/ exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings. Was comprehensive.	
3	*Methods / Approach*	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was not comprehensive.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Was comprehensive.	
4	*Results / Outcomes*	Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend. Was not comprehensive.	Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend. Was not comprehensive.	Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend. Was not comprehensive.	Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend. Was somewhat comprehensive.	All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend. Was comprehensive.	
5	*Discussion/ Summary/ Conclusions*	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes. Was not comprehensive.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes. Was not comprehensive.	Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes. Was not comprehensive.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly engaging or thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, but included no recommendations. Was somewhat comprehensive.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes. Was comprehensive.	
6	*Writing Quality*	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 6th edition APA. Was not comprehensive.	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 6th edition APA conventions. Was not comprehensive.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 6th edition APA conventions. Was not comprehensive.	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 6th edition APA. Was somewhat comprehensive.	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 6th edition APA. Was comprehensive.	

Comment:

DPELFS Oral Dissertation Rubric

		1	2	3	4	5	Score
1	*Organization*	Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time.	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well timed.	Some information presented out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.	Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.	Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	
2	*Originality*	Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach inappropriate and/or ignored previous well-established work in area.	Problem/purpose limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose moderately original or creative. Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced new or expanded on established ideas.	
3	*Significance/ Authenticity*	Project has no significance/authenticity to field and will make no contribution.	Project has little relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make little contribution.	Project only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.	Project has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make good contribution.	Project extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.	
4	*Discussion/ Summary/ Conclusions*	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations.	Discussion was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
5	*Delivery*	Presenter unsettled, uninterested, and unenthused. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance.	Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.	Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.	Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.	Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced presentation/performance.	

Comments :