

2012-2013 M.A in Multicultural Education Annual Assessment Report

Graduate and Professional Studies in Education

California State University, Sacramento

- 1. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment etc.), and/or the university baccalaureate learning goals? If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes? How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results? If no, why not?**

Due to the low number of applicants (10) in fall 2012, the Master of Art's program in multicultural education was put on hiatus for the 2012-2013 academic year. Thus, four courses that encompass direct instruction of the program's learning outcomes (*EDBM 205: Education for a Democratic, Pluralistic Society*; *EDBM 220: Multicultural Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment*; *EDBM 235: Research Seminar on Bilingualism and Language Varieties in Education*; and *EDBM 245: Advocacy, Change and Community*), as well as the research class (*EDBM 250: Education Research*) were not taught. Only two MA courses were taught in the 2012-2013 academic year; *EDBM 265: Thesis/Project Writing*, taught once in the fall and once in the spring. One component of this course is to prepare candidates for the comprehensive examination, and in each semester only one candidate used this as their culminating experience.

Nevertheless, all classes incorporate the program learning goals into instruction. For example, the first course, *EDBM 205: Education for a Democratic, Pluralistic Society*, and focuses on the core theoretical framework espoused by the program, Critical Pedagogy (CP). The key assignment in this course is the Critical Pedagogy Participatory Research Project which provides students with an understanding of the multiple levels that constitute CP (see *Critical Pedagogy Project.pdf* and *Critical pedagogy project presentation rubric.pdf*). In addition, *EDBM 235: Research Seminar on Bilingualism and Language Varieties in Education* focuses heavily on learning outcome #1, which is to read, synthesize and analyze research on curriculum and instruction specific to culturally and linguistically diverse populations. The primary assessment in this class requires students to conduct a field-based socio-linguistic research project culminating in a research paper. The final research paper must be a maximum of 15 full pages in length (not counting title page, references, tables, etc., typed in 12 font and double-spaced), include a literature review (2-3 pages minimum), and follow the APA Publication Manual

Writing Guide format. The topic requires instructor approval and is scored using the rubric below:

**EDBM 235: RESEARCH PAPER GRADING RUBRIC**

Research paper	Acceptable	Adequate	Unacceptable
Literature review			
Methodology			
Analysis			
APA format			
Instructor's comments:			

Moreover, each student is required to prepare and present a final (on 3.5) 10 minute power point presentation detailing the findings and analyses of your field research study and facilitate a 10 minute question and discussion session after the presentation.

**2. As a result of last year's assessment effort, have you implemented any other changes at the department, the college or the university, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting and planning? If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes? How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results? If no, why not?**

As stated above, the multicultural education program did not begin a new cohort in fall 2012. However, the program will undergo two significant changes, one that has already been implemented and correlates directly to *student advising*. Historically, the program conducts an oral interview with groups of applicants (e.g. 4-6) to assess their interest and knowledge of the program, answer questions, and introduce the basic tenets of multicultural education. One area that several professors have noted as problematic is student writing ability. In order to foresee any potential writing problems, an essay assessment of writing was implemented as part of the admissions process. Each applicant is required to answer the following question:

**Essay question**

Our program focuses on students that come from diverse cultural, ethnic, linguistic, or low socioeconomic backgrounds that historically have underachieved in American schools. Two

concepts that are often used to discuss the underachievement of minority students are “educational equity” and “educational equality”. In your own words, please describe the difference between these two concepts, using examples from either your own experience and/or knowledge of the field about this issue. Moreover, describe a success or obstacle that you have experienced in trying to promote the educational achievement, or efforts of community activism/engagement of historically underserved populations. Moreover, a rubric was designed to rate essays on both content and writing conventions:

Writing sample – content	Candidate clearly understands difference between educational equity and equality. Topic is clear with supporting details	Candidate clearly understands difference between educational equity and equality. Topic and supporting details could be clearer.	Candidate shows some understanding of difference between educational equity and equality, but could improve.	Candidate only addresses one of the two aspects.
Writing sample – grammar/spelling	Writer makes no errors in grammar or spelling that distracts the reader from the content.	Writer makes 1-2 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	Writer makes 3-4 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content.	Writer makes more than 4 errors in grammar or spelling that distracts the reader from the content.

A second modification will occur at the program level. In 2012-2013, a new course sequence will be used to increase student ability in (a) academic writing, and (b) research. This new course, *EDGR 260: Writing and Research across Disciplines*, will focus on introducing students to research within their field of study and across disciplines in the College of Education. In addition, students will be provided an overview of qualitative and quantitative methods and basic statistical concepts. In alignment with our program’s focus on solid writing, students will be expected to understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry within the discipline of education; understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in the discipline; practice reading and writing within the discipline; and practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing. Below is a model of the new delivery structure:

	Old Program Catalog Copy (deletions = strikethrough)	New Program Catalog copy (additions underlined)
First Semester	*EDBM 205 (3 units) (core requirement) *EDBM 220 (3 units) <del>EDBM 250 (3 units) (core requirement)</del> *EDBM 170 (3 units)	**EDBM 205 (3 units) (core requirement) **EDBM 220 (3 units) <u>EDGR 260 (3 units)</u> EDBM/ EDUC 170 (3 units)
Second Semester	*EDBM 235 (3 units) *EDBM 245 (3 units)	**EDBM 235 (3 units) **EDBM 245 (3 units) <u>EDBM 250 (3 units) (core requirement)</u>
Third Semester	EDBM 265 (all MA students) EDBM 565 (thesis/project candidates only)	EDBM 265 (all MA students) EDBM 565 (thesis/project candidates only)
		Thesis/project students need 3 elective units; exam students need 6 elective units.

\*denotes a 6-week course; \*\*denotes a 8-week course

We anticipate that student writing and research ability will strengthen due to the incorporation of this class. In addition, in the past several courses (EDBM 205; EDBM 220; EDBM 250, EDBM 235, EDBM 245) were delivered in six-week intervals, with each having two Saturday sessions. However, in the new program these courses will be expanded to eight-week intervals (including two Saturdays), except EDBM 250. This course will be expanded to 15 weeks. In essence, graduate students will experience more face-to-face time than in the past.

### **3. What PROGRAM (not course) learning outcome(s) have you assessed this academic year?**

The MA in multicultural Education focused on all four learning outcomes, which are:

- a) Read, synthesize and analyze research on curriculum and instruction specific to culturally and linguistically diverse populations.
- b) Read and interpret research focused on specific language and cultural needs to inform the development of appropriate curriculum, instructional practices, and/or research/project foci.
- c) Develop and utilize a theoretical framework to undertake the development of a curriculum, research project or thesis that reflects a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations.
- d) Distinguish between, and write a coherent curriculum plan and/or research project reflective of, Multicultural Education tenets and/or from a Critical Pedagogy framework.

These outcomes were specifically assessed as part of the comprehensive examination, which was administered once in fall 2012 and once in spring 2013.

#### **4. What method(s)/measure(s) have you used to collect the data?**

The primary assessment that was utilized in the 2012-1013 academic year was the comprehensive examination. The method/measures utilized to collect data are as follows:

Learning Outcome #1 - Read, synthesize and analyze research on curriculum and instruction specific to culturally and linguistically diverse populations. After analyzing the exam's six-page vignette, students (as researchers at this site) are asked, "*...what would you suggest that faculty address in the existing curriculum and instructional methods to better serve African American students? Describe two existing methods/strategies espoused by African American researchers that the faculty could adopt; please indicate how each model reflects critical race theory, critical pedagogy, and/or Afrocentric pedagogy*". Thus, comprehensive examination students must synthesize, analyze, and then create curriculum, satisfying Learning Outcome #1.

Learning Outcome #2 - Read and interpret research focused on specific language and cultural needs to inform the development of appropriate curriculum, instructional practices, and/or research/project foci. In the vignette, students must be cognizant of social, political, and linguistic issues related to (a) Second Language Acquisition, (2) African American English (a.k.a. Ebonics), and (3) Code Switching. This question challenges students to consider biases that English Learners may encounter and to propose and

defend a plan that would create a positive learning environment for these students.

Learning Outcome #3 - Develop and utilize a theoretical framework to undertake the development of a curriculum, research project or thesis that reflects a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations. A thesis or project, of course, will incorporate a theoretical framework relevant to the research problem. Thus, Multicultural Education MA faculty deemed it necessary to assess if students comprehended the two primary theories taught in EDBM 205, Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race Theory. The exam requires students to, “*Describe 4 principles that underlie both critical pedagogy and critical race theory. Next, describe 2 differences between these two theories. Lastly, how do these theories explain the inequities found in the public school system, including solutions they offer for systemic changes to address inequities.*” This question, which is the first on the exam, generally takes ½ of the exam time (e.g., 4 hours).

Learning Outcome #4 - Distinguish between, and write a coherent curriculum plan and/or research project reflective of, Multicultural Education tenets and/or from a Critical Pedagogy framework. The final question on the exam asks students to describe how they would conduct research on a group that is often omitted: parents. The vignette states: *Finally, you feel that it is imperative that Riverside High make a concerted effort to outreach to parents and the surrounding community. Although the administration claims it provides parents and the community with solid outreach services, your instinct tells you otherwise. Describe the methods you would use to ascertain how parents and the outside community feel about the education at Riverside High.*

### **5. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for the program learning outcome?**

On the comprehensive examination, each question is scored by two faculty members. The following rubric is used to assess student progress:

Criteria	Unacceptable	Needs Oral Revision	Satisfactory
Learning Outcome #1 - Read, synthesize and analyze research on curriculum and instruction specific to culturally and linguistically diverse populations			

<p>Learning Outcome #2 - Read and interpret research focused on specific language and cultural needs to inform the development of appropriate curriculum, instructional practices, and/or research/project foci on two of the following three topics: (a) Second Language Acquisition, (2) African American English (a.k.a. Ebonics), and (3) Code Switching</p>			
<p>Learning Outcome #3 - Develop and utilize a theoretical framework to undertake the development of a curriculum, research project or thesis that reflects a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Clear understanding of Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race</p>			
<p>Learning Outcome #4 - Distinguish between, and write a coherent curriculum plan and/or research that describes how they would conduct research on a group that is often omitted: parents.</p>			

**6. What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including the percentage of students who meet each standard? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement?**

Two students, one in fall 2012 and one in spring 2013, took the comprehensive examination. Thus, data collection regarding the specific learning goals is sparse. Although both students ultimately passed the exam, analysis of the results does reveal the need for future modifications in instruction and exam administration. The results were as follows:



	Fall 2012 examinee	Spring 2013 examinee
Learning outcome #1: Read, synthesize and analyze research on curriculum and instruction specific to culturally and linguistically diverse populations	Initial score = pass	Initial score = pass
Learning outcome #2: Read and interpret research focused on specific language and cultural needs to inform the development of appropriate curriculum, instructional practices, and/or research/project foci on two of the following three topics: (a) Second Language Acquisition, (2) African American English (a.k.a. Ebonics), and (3) Code Switching	Initial score on SLA = Needs oral revision  Ebonics = pass	Initial score on Code- switching = pass  Ebonics = pass
Learning outcome #3: Develop and utilize a theoretical framework to undertake the development of a curriculum, research project or thesis that reflects a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Clear understanding of Critical Pedagogy and Critical Race	Initial score = pass	Initial score = pass
Learning outcome #4: Distinguish between, and write a coherent curriculum plan and/or research that describes how they would conduct research on a group that is often omitted: parents.	Initial score = needs oral revision	Initial score = needs oral revision

Due to the fact that students are given an opportunity to orally revise their responses, ultimately both exam students satisfied the learning goals. What is significant is that a direct correlation exists between WHEN students were enrolled in the research class and courses that encompass the learning outcomes. In specific, learning outcome #3 is focused on in *EDBM 205: Education for a Democratic, Pluralistic Society*, while learning outcome #1 is covered in the cohorts second class, *EDBM 220: Multicultural Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment*. The third course is *EDBM 250: Education Research* and the instructor connects basic research methods to the learning outcomes. Not surprisingly, both students successfully passed these outcomes on their initial response on the examination. Learning outcome #2 is focused on in *EDBM 235: Research Seminar on Bilingualism and Language Varieties in Education*, while learning outcome #4 is explicitly addressed in *EDBM 245: Advocacy, Change and Community*. In the past, both of these courses have occurred AFTER EDBM 250, and thus direct links between acquiring research skills and the content of these courses did not explicitly occur.

Finally, data from the fall 2012 and spring 2013 exams align with evidence from previous administrations in that learning outcome #4 necessitated oral revisions. In retrospect, there are two factors that multicultural education faculty consider to enhance student effectiveness. First, as previously discussed *EDBM 250* will now be taken while students are enrolled in *EDBM 235* and *EDBM 245*, which should increase students' ability to connect course content (Language issues; Parent and Community Advocacy) with research skills. Second, and more importantly, the vignette posed by the authors asks,

Finally, you feel that it is imperative that Riverside High make a concerted effort to outreach to parents and the surrounding community. Although the administration claims it provides parents and the community with solid outreach services, your instinct tells you otherwise. Describe the methods you would use to ascertain how parents and the outside community feel about the education at Riverside High

Oral revision data indicates that students know the content, and the combination of advocacy, parental involvement, and research may not be well-defined as faculty would like. Instead, it may be incumbent upon the faculty to revisit this question and make it clearer for exam takers.

**7. As a result of this year's assessment effort, do you anticipate or propose any changes for your program (e.g. structures, content, or learning outcomes)? If so, what changes do you anticipate? How do you plan to implement those changes? How do you know if these changes will achieve the desired results?**

As previously discussed, the primary change that will occur in the upcoming academic year is the implementation of a new delivery model. The program will incorporate a new course, *EDGR 260*, devoted to (a) introducing students to quantitative and qualitative research and (b) writing in the genre, while moving *EDBM 250* into the second semester. These changes have already been passed within the College of Education and are now at the University level. Two primary pieces of information will provide evidence as to its effectiveness, yet unfortunately we will be unable to assess these changes next year. This is due to the fact that the changes will affect students' ability in writing a thesis or project, but students entering in fall 2013 will at the earliest complete their MA in December 2014. Moreover, this same time frame stymies the

ability to accurately assess program modifications on exam students; the earliest they will be tested on the overall learning outcomes at the program level will also be in December 2014.

The re-positioning of EDBM 250 necessitates a change in a key assignment that affects students completing a thesis or project. In fall 2009 BMED faculty, the *EDBM 250* instructor revised the first semester assessment into a “*First Semester Proposal*.” This assignment, which had no specified page length, required candidates to submit “a proposal that outlines/discusses your prospective research or project agenda.” Candidates were asked to incorporate key components of a thesis or project into their proposal, such as a statement of the problem, possible research questions and/or project ideas, keywords/phrases/topics to guide a literature review, and a preliminary research design. Analysis of the first semester proposals submitted by the fall 2009 cohort (n = 20) displayed some significant patterns. First, the majority of proposals had a clear statement of the problem; only two proposals appeared to be unclear as to author’s intention. Second, although no page limit was suggested, it was assumed that proposals would range between 5 to 10 pages. However, submissions ranged from 5 to 23 pages, with an average length of 18 pages. Candidates had done extensive background work on their topics and described the rationale behind their “statement of the problem” by citing relevant research and theory discussed in previous courses. Although positive, the first semester proposals did show BMED faculty areas that could be improved, such as in constructing a literature review. In fall 2011 the text; *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences* (Galvan, 2006) into the course, as well as referred journal articles and critiques of a literature review. The result of this modification indicated that the First Semester Proposal assignment for the 2011 cohort was stronger in comparison to previous cohorts.

In fall 2013, this assignment will not be used as a first semester proposal. Student proposals will be evaluated on chapters one through three (see First Semester Proposal Fall2011.pdf) to assess their progress in completing their thesis or project.

## **8. Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year? How?**

As discussed above, accurately assessing the learning outcome(s) at the program level will be difficult, given that entering students will not be assessed via thesis, project, or comprehensive examination until fall 2104. At the class level, however, focus will be given to learning outcome #3, which states that students: *Develop and utilize a theoretical framework to undertake the development of a curriculum, research project or thesis that reflects a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations.* This outcome will be assessed as part of the research proposal, using a rubric that focuses specifically on student ability to articulate a theoretical framework.

Moreover, due to the program's hiatus status, assessing learning outcomes will also focus on graduates of the MA in multicultural education. Several years ago a survey was sent to graduates that asked them to respond to the following six questions:

- 1) What position did you hold before completing the multicultural education master's program?
- 2) Upon receiving the MA, did you advance to different position (e.g., you were promoted from classroom teacher to research teacher or you were given additional responsibilities) Please describe.
- 3) Have you given any consideration to applying for a post graduate degree? Explain
- 4) Have you applied to a Ph.D. program? Which program and when will you start?
- 5) Have you made any professional presentation at your school, in your district or at a professional conference? Please describe.
- 6) Have you been a part of any publication? If so, please list the complete citation.

As part of our efforts to both (a) assess program learning outcomes, and (b) increase recruitment efforts, multicultural education faculty will be sending out a follow-up survey. Program graduates since 2009, when the revision of the master's took place, will be asked additional questions relevant to our 4 learning outcomes. The intent of this effort is two-fold. First, systematic program assessment can only strengthen content delivery by understanding what specific knowledge our graduates possess. Second, faculty in multicultural education would like to share with the community the positions and career paths graduates have taken, and use their voices to express how the program has enhanced their knowledge relevant to the learning outcomes. As the College of Education revamps its web site, the multicultural

education program would like to create an “alumni profile” section and disseminate this information.