Language and Literacy 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: M.A. in Education in Language and Literacy

B2. Report author(s): Porfirio M. Loeza, Ph.D.

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 17
*Us*e the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:
(http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
x	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [*]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
X	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were **assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:** a. b. c.

[*] One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Our M.A. includes two other embedded programs (including the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language and Literacy Added Authorization) and it is organized into tiers. Several years ago our program instituted a system of "tiers" or levels. Each tier represents either the Added Authorization or credential level of the program. Tier one represents the four sequence courses for the added authorization and tier two represents the second level of courses, a sequence which comprises the specialist credential courses. Although students are not cohorted per se, the course schedule attempts to sequence the courses in a way where students sequentially progress through the program. Candidates take Tier 1 classes (12 units) to obtain the Added Authorization. If candidates wish to obtain the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential, they build on the Tier 1 knowledge by continuing on to the Tier 2 classes (12 units).

Our program closely aligns with the following PLOs:

- 8. Reading

As a graduate program with an emphasis on reading, understanding "Reading" is a central learning outcome for our program. In keeping with the university's mission, the program provides **in-depth knowledge, skills, and experience** that enables each candidate to develop an **advanced professional perspective on** reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

We recognize that our graduates, those with the Reading Specialist Credential in particular, have been and will continue be called upon to provide leadership not just in terms of curriculum and instruction at the level of the school, but also in terms of staff development and parent education at the level of the district. Our graduates, for example, have served as "trainers of trainers" in districts that put together teams of coaches trained by our graduates to go out into the schools and provide close-up assistance to teachers in the trenches working to implement new reading programs. Our graduates have served as district-wide coordinators for direct writing assessment systems with significant influence on what and how writing is taught to large numbers of children. Our graduates have served as coordinators for district textbook adoption committees charged with making crucial decisions that affect armies of children for years at a time.

Because the faculty understand the vital importance of leadership in Language and Literacy and the role our graduates play in providing it in the region, we believe that our strongest contribution in this area lies in our capacity to teach our students to become clear, critical, organized thinkers with respect to curriculum materials, research studies, theoretical frameworks, and instructional strategies.

Our M.A. includes two other embedded programs (including the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language and Literacy Added Authorization) and it is organized into tiers. Several years ago our program instituted a system of "tiers" or levels. Each tier represents either the Added Authorization or credential level of the program. Tier one represents the four sequence courses for the added authorization and tier two represents the second level of courses, a sequence which comprises the specialist credential courses. Although students are not cohorted per se, the course schedule attempts to sequence the courses in a way where students sequentially progress through the program. Candidates take Tier 1 classes (12 units) to obtain the Added Authorization. If candidates wish to obtain the

Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential, they build on the Tier 1 knowledge by continuing on to the Tier 2 classes (12 units).

Tier 1 (12 units) - Language and Literacy Added Authorization

- EDTE 200 – Practicum in Decoding and Fluency: Assessment and Instruction (3 units)
- EDTE 201 – Practicum in Comprehension: Assessment and Instruction (3 units)
- EDTE 203 – Teaching and Assessing Writing in the PreK-12 Classroom (3 units)
- EDTE 205 – Psychology and Sociology of Literacy Instruction (3 units)

Tier 2 (12 units) – Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language

- EDTE 202 – Language and Literacy Development in Multicultural Settings (3 units)
- EDTE 206 – Leadership in Literacy (3 units)
- EDTE 207 – Advanced Practicum in Reading Difficulties: Assessment and Intervention (3 units)
- EDTE 209 – Literature for the Diverse PreK-12 Classroom: Issues, Models and Strategies (3 units)

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

The College of Education has undergone major restructuring changes during the 2013-14 academic year. Our former departmental structure has changed from Teacher Education to our new department know as the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Department. The changes were structurally as well as substantive based on the new standards for advance programs in Reading and Language Arts. In Fall 2014 our program will be graduating the current cohort and will not be admitting new students into the next year. Our goal is to regroup and map out our future as a program.

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q1.4)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q1.4)**

The Masters of Arts in, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and Adult Reading Certificate Program at California State University, Sacramento, are part of the M.A. in Education with an Emphasis in Language and Literacy. The program is currently approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Our M.A. in Language and Literacy has a systematic assessment system that is found online at the following URL:

http://edweb.csus.edu/edte/assets/RCCPASManual2006.pdf

The CSUS ***Reading Certificate and Credential Program Assessment System*** (hereafter, **RCCPAS**) is designed to fulfill the criteria mandated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). RCCPAS uses a portfolio system either in hard copy or electronic format. Successful completion of RCCPAS and acceptable academic performance in course work leads to a recommendation for a specialilzed certificate or credential in the area of reading and language arts to CCTC. As part of this system, students are responsible for:

- Collecting evidence of their accomplishments;
- Analyzing their evidence in writing;
- Presenting and assembling their evidence for evaluation.

Assessment Process: Students begin collecting and cataloguing coursework (clinical planning and assessment documents, written responses and/or analyses of class readings, etc.) and artifacts from their own teaching (e.g., lesson plans, journal entries, class notes, assessments, etc.). Learning log notes, class discussion notes, purposeful summaries, excerpts from class papers that show how they synthesized a variety of studies, informal anecdotal notes that capture their observations of experiences, and the like also provide evidence.

Reflective Writing: Students then complete some reflective writing on two levels. The first level is an introduction to the portfolio. The second is a series of what this portfolio system calls "entry slips." An entry slip is a detailed analysis of how the student met our standards as it relates to **Clinical Experiences**, **Instructional Competencies** and **Professional Perspectives**. The entry slips are used by the reviewer to make judgments about a student's competence in each of the areas specified. The portfolio is returned to the student with copious feedback and the students are then able to use this portfolio in their own professional settings. It becomes an invaluable tool for them.

Clearly Articulated Program Links to Campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals:
Because this is a graduate program we have not mapped our learning outcomes specifically to the campus baccalaureate learning goals.
Updated Plan that Clearly Identifies Program Learning Goals, Assessment Strategies, and Processes by Which Data Inform Program Curriculum Decisions:
Since our M.A. is organized into tiers (or levels), the following are the learning goals for each of the tiers:

<u>TIER ONE: Certificate Level (12 units)</u>

<u>Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 1:</u> Document that you have a thorough knowledge base in each of the following areas: a) how children learn to read and write; b) the structure of the English language including phonology, morphology, orthography; c) second language acquisition; d) the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing; e) psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing.

<u>Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 2:</u> Demonstrate that you can articulate and apply an understanding of the research on instruction in reading and the language arts.

<u>Professional Perspective/Certificate Level/ Item 3:</u>   Provide experienced-based evidence that you have the ability to respect, understand and teach students who are different from you, including ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences.

<u>TIER TWO: Credential Level (12 units)</u>

<u>Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 1:</u>   Provide evidence that you have knowledge and skills that enable you to provide leadership at the level of the whole school, the district, and the state in the following areas: a) making program,

curriculum, instructional and intervention decisions; b) providing successful staff development to assure the effective implementation of those decisions.

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 2:   Provide evidence that you can apply research-based knowledge in the analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and success in both reading and writing instruction. Include evidence of your capacity to evaluate published instructional materials.

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 3:   Provide evidence that you understand and can use knowledge of effective reading and language arts instruction, intervention, and curriculum in program planning.

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 4:   Provide evidence that you have acquired an in-depth knowledge and understanding of specialized areas of study that influence and affect teaching and learning in the field of reading and language arts.

Professional Perspective/Credential Level/ Item 5:   Demonstrate that you have _research_-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of how students from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read and write.

TIER THREE: M.A. in Education: Emphasis in Language and Literacy

The Graduate Program Area Group (GPAG), which includes faculty teaching in our program and three other options, identifies its mission as providing opportunities for students to earn an M.A. in an educational area upon demonstration of having accomplished the following set of learning outcomes. Our program uses these learning outcomes as overarching criteria for our M.A. The following is a partial list of the learning outcomes for the M.A.:

- Students will be able to synthesize topics of phonological processing, spelling and emergent literacy as well as early intervention programs.
- Students will be able to analyze vocabulary development, text structures and comprehension.
- Students will be able to discuss the psychological and socio-linguistic aspects of reading and writing, including issues related to second language acquisition and literacy development.
- Students will be able to apply research principles and methodology embedded within the field of language and literacy.
- Students will be able to critically examine specific issues of language difference, socio-cultural differences and gender.

External Assessment and Accreditation Outcomes, where appropriate
    Our M.A. has two embedded advanced teaching credentials in the area of reading and language arts. They are the **Reading and Literacy Added Authorization** and the **Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential Program.** As such we are accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). CCTC made a site visit and reviewed our program in November 2011. We received a positive review on the part of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP)[*] to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

[*] **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **ALL** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2**)
	4. Don't know (**Go to Q2.2**)
	5. Not Applicable (**Go to Q2.2**)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014**?

	1. Yes
x	2. No (**If no, go to Q3.1**)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In **SOME course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In **ALL course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (**If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information**)
	3. Don't know (**Go to Part 3**)
	4. Not Applicable (**Go to Part 3**)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do

students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Our primary data has been collected through the end-of-program portfolios that students in our program submit. The following are the strengths and areas for improvement based on this data set.

Strengths:

- Candidate Performance: Our candidates continue to exhibit strong assessment skills in the area of decoding. The Added Authorization/credential portfolios reflect depth of understanding in reviewing an entire school/district level literacy program. Our completers show evidence in their portfolios of this skill.
- Most of our graduate students are doing extremely well in most areas to achieve the expectations. Since our program is an advanced program, our candidates have a number of years of teaching experience and bring this wealth of knowledge into our program. This is a major asset that allows them to perform extremely well in our program.
- Program effectiveness: Anecdotal feedback from our local partners confirms that our completers are successful once they read the field.

Areas for improvement:

- Candidate performance: Academic writing was previously identified as an area for improvement. CSUS has approved a new Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement. All students must pass this requirement as of Fall 2010 or take an approved course that improves writing skills.

- Program effectiveness: Each course in either the Added Authorization or credential our program has a Signature Assignment. A few of the courses have a rubric for their Signature Assignments that have been reviewed by the core faculty. Our goal for the current year is to establish systematic rubrics for each of our courses and to have them reviewed by the core faculty. A second area for improvement is increasing the feedback we get from our school/district level partners in university's service area.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [_____Reading_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [__]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program **assess in the 2013-2014 academic year**? [__1__]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO **in 2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
X	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q4.4**)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
X	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) **[key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)]** that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The core measure of completer performance in our program continues to be the three major case studies that are completed in EDTE 200, 201 and 206. Completers also submit either an Added Authorization or credential portfolio. Most students submit this portfolio at the end of their coursework. Our program is projecting the implementation of an Advisory Group Survey and the creation of a process wherein we collect Dispositions Papers from our

candidates. Our goal with the Advisory Group Surveys was to continue our close relationships with working professionals in our local school districts. Our attempt was to formalize what has always been a professional relationship. We have periodically asked these individuals to give us feedback about the content of our program and the preparation of our candidates. From this qualitative data, faculty continues to discuss at their monthly area group meetings, concerns expressed by the advisory group.

In addition to the end-of-program portfolio, a consistent practice in our program has been to assess candidates through their performance on the Signature Assignments for each course. As previously stated, each course within our Added Authorization and credential has a Signature Assignment. Faculty instructors rate these papers on the following criteria which go beyond the course content: (a) clarity of writing and responsiveness to the assigned task; (b) integration of theory/research to support response; (c) demonstration of willingness to consider alternative perspectives as well as those that differ significantly from their own; and (d) demonstration of higher order thinking/intellectual curiosity. These mirror the core outcomes which all graduate students in the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Department must achieve. A passing grade for these papers is a "B." These are formative assessments and candidates are allowed to re-write and re-submit these papers so all candidates should ultimately achieve a passing grade, if they opt to re-write these papers.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion**?**

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? **[Select one only**]

X- see narrative below	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

The criteria of performance for our program are based on the standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Per CCTC, "The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program includes a purposeful, developmentally-designed sequence of course work and field experiences that builds upon the foundational knowledge, skills and competencies developed in the preservice program. It effectively prepares candidates to teach all students to read and helps candidates understand the challenges of developing literacy among California's diverse population. Successful candidates will be able to maximize literacy development for all students."

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only]**

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
X	4. Use other means. Specify: Reading Certificate and Reading & Language Arts Specialist Credential Handbook approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2003)

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

The core faculty in the program has met to review our assessment measures and discuss the effectiveness of our program. We continue to use the following course-embedded assessments to appraise our program.

    i.   Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 (fluency emphasis) and EDTE 201(comprehension emphasis)
    ii.   Comprehensive case study of a school/district's literacy program in EDTE 206
    iii.   Culminating Portfolio

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

Our program is continuing to use Signature Assignments within each course as formative assessments for our Added Authorization and credential candidates. Each course in the Added Authorization as well as the credential program includes a Signature Assignment. These assignments are intended to be core assignments that are central to the content of the course. In sum, they represent essential content for each course.

Signature Assignments used for Formative Assessment
EDTE 200   Case Study: Fluency
EDTE 201   Case Study: Comprehension
EDTE 202   Case Study: Language, Literacy and Culture
EDTE 203   Case Study: Self as a Teacher of Writing and Authentic Writing Assessment

EDTE 205   Case Study: Applying Research to a Reading Curriculum
EDTE 206   Case Study: Examining a Whole School
EDTE 207   Case Study: A Seriously Disabled Reader
EDTE 209   Position Paper: A Professional Perspective on an Issue Related to Juvenile
Literature

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.5)**

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.6)**

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(Go to Q4.7)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.7)**

The table below provides additional details about the nature of each key assessment that is used in our program.

"Overview of Key Assessments"

(* = Language and Literacy Added Authorization; ** = Reading and Language Leadership Specialist Credential)

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)	When administered	Details about Administration	CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed
Assessment #1. *Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 and EDTE 201* (* and **)	Formative	End of each semester (Tier 1)	Individual faculty assesses candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-11
Assessment #2. *Comprehensive case study of student with severe reading difficulties in EDTE 207* (**)	Formative	First semester: Tier 2	Instructors of class assess candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-1,13, 14, 15, 16
Assessment #3. *Comprehensive case study of a school/district l literacy in EDTE 206* (**)	Formative	End of Tier 2	Instructor of class assesses candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Assessment #4. *Culminating Portfolio* (* and **)	Summative	End of program	Faculty in program work collaboratively to assess each candidate	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17-20

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The VALUE critical thinking rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 10 student papers selected from two required core courses offered in spring 2013: Statistics (Soc. 215) and Theory (Soc. 240). The graduate assessment committee is made up of four faculty members, each of whom read two papers. To determine the final scores, the group came together to discuss the similarities and differences of our scores until a consensus was reached. The group met again a week later, after reading 8 more papers. All papers were agreed upon with one exception. This one paper was re-read and the average score was used as our final data.

This is the first time that our graduate program has used a rubric (The VALUE rubric) to EXPLICITLY AND DIRECTLY assess our students' critical thinking skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students' critical thinking skill even though our sample size is small. We plan to include more papers in our program's future assessment studies.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [__1___]
NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum			x		
3. Improving advising and mentoring			x		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				x	
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations				x	
6. Developing/updating assessment plan				x	
7. Annual assessment reports			x		
8. Program review				x	
9. Prospective student and family information				x	
10. Alumni communication			x		
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)			x		
12. Program accreditation	x				
13. External accountability reporting requirement	x				
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations				x	
15. Strategic planning			x		
16. Institutional benchmarking				x	
17. Academic policy development or modification			x		

18. Institutional Improvement			x		
19. Resource allocation and budgeting			x		
20. New faculty hiring			x		
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			x		
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Our program is in the first year of major and significant changes prompted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and the approval of new standards for advanced specialists programs in Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialists. There have been changes in course content has been revised to meet the new standards and we are in the midst of our first year of implementation approved by the CCTC. We continue to use Signature Assignments as well as the end-of-program portfolio as a summative assessment for both the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language and Literacy Added Authorization.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q5.3)**
X: See narrative	3. Don't know **(Go to Q5.3)**

NOTE: In fall 2014, the Language and Literacy Program faculty will meet to determine what changes are needed to strengthen the program. Specifically, we will review course embedded assessments as noted in Table 1 in relationship to prior feedback from OAPA.

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global

	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
X	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to **assess but not included above:** **NOTE: We did not accept any new students for the 2014-15 school year**. **In fall 2014, we will assess all programs goals and assessments.**

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

X	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **developed** a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_EDTE 206_____]

The core faculty in the program has met to review our assessment measures and discuss the effectiveness of our program. We continue to use the following course-embedded assessments to appraise our program.

i.   Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 (fluency emphasis) and EDTE 201(comprehension emphasis)
ii. Comprehensive case study of a school/district's literacy program in EDTE 206
iii. Culminating Portfolio

The table below provides additional details about the nature of each key assessment.

Table 1: Overview of Key Assessments

(* = Language and Literacy Added Authorization; ** = Reading and Language Leadership Specialist Credential)

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)	When administered	Details about Administration	CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed
Assessment #1. *Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 and EDTE 201* (* and **)	Formative	End of each semester (Tier 1)	Individual faculty assesses candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-11
Assessment #2. *Comprehensive case study of student with severe reading difficulties in EDTE 207* (**)	Formative	First semester: Tier 2	Instructors of class assess candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-1,13, 14, 15, 16
Assessment #3. *Comprehensive case study of a school/district l literacy in EDTE 206* (**)	Formative	End of Tier 2	Instructor of class assesses candidate work	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15

Assessment Tool	Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)	When administered	Details about Administration	CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed
Assessment #4. *Culminating Portfolio* (* and **)	Summative	End of program	Faculty in program work collaboratively to assess each candidate	Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17-20

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: M.A. in Education in Language and Literacy

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Department of Graduate and Professional Studies in Education – College of Education

A9. Department Chair's Name: Dr. Susan Heredia

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [_1___]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
X	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):
A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 0
A12.1. List all the name(s): [_____]
A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [___ ___]

Master Degree Program(s):
A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1
A13.1. List all the name(s): M.A. in Education in Language and Literacy
A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1

Credential Program(s):
A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 2
A14.1. List all the names: Reading Certificate; and, Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Doctorate Program(s)
A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____