

2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Report:

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- 1. Critical Thinking
- 2. Information Literacy
- 3. Written Communication
- 4. Oral Communication
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 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, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

All the PLO's noted above are addressed in one or more of our graduate courses in Educational Leadership Program. All are embedded to some degree in each of the program courses as evidenced by all the course syllabi.

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- 4. N/A

5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

1. Yes
 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.5.

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

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

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

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

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Although this PLO is covered in other program courses, an example of the how this PLO is assessed in one of the courses will be noted. *In the Foundations of Educational Administration* (EDLP 201), a legal case study is assigned for analysis and review pertaining to a landmark court decision as it relates to Educational Administration and public schools. As such, student skills specifically associated with PLO Inquiry and Analysis (and others) are assessed via a specific rubric utilized by the professor in grading this key course assignment: 'The Sonoma Case'.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

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

4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

No file attached

No file attached

| Q2.4. PLO | Q2.5. Stdrd | Q2.6. Rubric | Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO: |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. In the student handbook/advising handbook |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. In the university catalogue |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 10. Other, specify: <input type="text" value="California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report 2015"/> |

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

- Key Course Assessment
- Class discussions and feedback
- Assigned research papers
- Collaborative class projects

Via scored rubric on a specific key course assignment (The Sonoma Case) and performance on written assignments

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- 6. E-Portfolios
- 7. Other Portfolios
- 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:

Q3.3.2. Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data.

- A Rubric was developed and implemented to be utilized in scoring the Key Course Assessment: *The Sonoma Case*
- Other measures included assigned research papers and class discussions/oral exams.
- Field Study Progress in Capstone Class

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

1-5

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

5-6

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Professor Discretion/judgement

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Professor Discretion /Judgement

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

26

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

All

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

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

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews

7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

Key Coarse Assignment

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
- 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)

- 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
- 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

See attachment

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?


Program Specific Candidate Information: Number of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported:


Fall 2013
Enrolled: 36 Credential, 1 Intern
Completers: 17 Credential, 1 Intern

Spring 2014
Enrolled: 16 Credential, 0 Interns
Completers: 0 Credential, 0 Interns

Fall 2014
Enrolled: 30 Credential, 0 Interns
Completers: 15 Credential, 0 Interns

Spring 2015
Enrolled: 13 Credential, 0 Interns
Completers: 0 Credential, 0 Interns

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

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

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

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

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

The EDLP Program is currently undergoing modifications to better address the new revised California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Standards for School Administrators. As such, the connection between course content will better align and explicitly address all the standards and noted PLO's. Key will be the continual development and refinement of key course assessment and related rubrics.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

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

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1. Very | 2. Quite | 3. Some | 4. Not at | 5. N/A |
|------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-----------|

| | Much | a Bit | | All | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Improving specific courses | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. Modifying curriculum | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. Improving advising and mentoring | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. Revising learning outcomes/goals | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. Developing/updating assessment plan | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Annual assessment reports | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Program review | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Prospective student and family information | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Alumni communication | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. Program accreditation | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. External accountability reporting requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 15. Strategic planning | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. Institutional benchmarking | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Academic policy development or modifications | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 18. Institutional improvement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. Resource allocation and budgeting | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. New faculty hiring | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Professional development for faculty and staff | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Recruitment of new students | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 23. Other, specify: | <input type="text"/> | | | | |

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

The above assessment data provided a basis for ongoing discussion and subsequent improvement regarding the need to better align the courses with the State Standards. Specifically, the need to re-construct/modify all course syllabi to better address the State Standards (and PLO's), activities associated with the Standards relative to each course, and the means to assess them.

In addition, substantive changes were made to course descriptions to avoid duplication of course activities or blind spots regarding specific course objectives. This process led to the adoption of an Objectives Matrix that better aligned and organized all the program instructional objectives. This process is not yet complete and will be revisited at the beginning of the fall 2016 semester when all faculty return

(Remember: Save your progress)


Additional Assessment Activities


Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. [Word limit: 300]**

- Commission on Teacher Credentialing Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Survey (2015) & EDLP Program Exit Survey (2013-2014)

 No file attached

 No file attached


Q7.


What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]


- 1. Critical Thinking
- 2. Information Literacy
- 3. Written Communication
- 4. Oral Communication
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 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, specify any PLOs not included above:


- a.
- b.
- c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

P1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

MA Leadership

P1.1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Leadership MA

P2.

Report Author(s):

Francisco Reveles

P2.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Sue Heredia

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Chia-Jung Chung

P3.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Education - Graduate

P4.

College:

College of Education

P5.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

P6.

Program Type:

- 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- 2. Credential
- 3. Master's Degree
- 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P7.1. List all the names:

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

Don't know

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

P8.1. List all the names:

Master of Arts in Education

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

1

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

1

P9.1. List all the names:

Preliminary Administrative Services

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan...**

| | 1. Before 2010-11 | 2. 2011-12 | 3. 2012-13 | 4. 2013-14 | 5. 2014-15 | 6. No Plan | 7. Don't know |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| P11. developed? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| P11.1. last updated? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

 **No file attached**


P12.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

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

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

P13.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

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

P14.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- 1. Yes, indicate:
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

P14.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

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

(**Remember: Save your progress**)

PILOT ASSESSMENT #1 and Scoring Rubric for EDLP 201 (Foundations of Educational Admin.)

Major Project: The Sonoma Case/Migrant Children in California

The pilot assessment in this foundations course introduces students to the various dimensions associated with school administration that emphasize leadership, legal/policy considerations and issues pertaining to linguistic and cultural diversity.

| Plan Element | Maximum Points | Weak Response | Adequate Response | Exemplary Response |
|---|----------------|---|--|--|
| Review and analysis of potential issues (Required Fields: <i>legal, instructional, administrative, public relations, and human impact</i>) that the Sonoma Case raises. | 8 | Lacks depth of research and clarity. Limited discussion with regard to potential issues arising from the case study. (0-4 points) | Outlines at least one issue for the given fields and includes an adequate discussion of each. Depth of discussion is still limited. (5-6 points) | Goes beyond fields identified with exemplary analysis and discussion for each. Succinct explanation of how and when specific issue could arise. (7-8 points) |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS IN THIS AREA Given the general lack of experience of the students in this introductory course, approximately 40 percent scored in the ADEQUATE RESPONSE area with 30 per cent in the EXEMPLARY RESPONSE area and the remaining in WEAK RESPONSE are. Not unexpected, but still provided a frame of reference as to their level of understanding as they begin the Ed. Admin. program. | | | | |

This case study assessment piece required students to address content knowledge and meet performance expectations that deal with organizational and systems leadership. Per this plan element, students analyzed domains that shape the school and the educational process. A three level rubric (weak, adequate, exemplary) was used to evaluate students' performance on this assessment, and as indicated in the Summary Analysis of Results synopsis, 30% of students scored adequate while 40% scored exemplary.

| Plan Element | Maximum Points | Weak Response | Adequate Response | Exemplary Response |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| Interest Groups and Related Political Agendas pertaining to the Sonoma Case | 12 | Limited interest groups/agendas identified (Less than four). Little analysis regarding their impact on the decision-making process for school administrators. (0-6 points) | At least 5 interest groups identified and their respective agendas discussed. (7-9 points) | Six or more potential interest groups identified and their political agendas discussed in detail. Impact on the administrative decision-making process succinctly discussed and analyzed. (10-12 points) |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS IN THIS AREA Similar to the area noted above, approx. 45 per cent of students scored in the ADEQUATE RESPONSE area and 40 per cent in the EXEMPLARY RESPONSE area with the rest falling in the WEAK RESPONSE category. Overall, not unexpected as student begin to broaden their perspectives beyond those of teachers in the classroom. | | | | |

A key element assessed was students' knowledge of how the political domain

shapes/constrains school leadership and in turn the educational process. Again using a three level rubric (weak, adequate, exemplary) to evaluate students, 45% scored “adequate” and 40% scored “exemplary” as indicated in the Summary of Analysis of Results.

| Plan Element | Maximum Points | Weak Response | Adequate Response | Exemplary Response |
|---|----------------|--|---|---|
| Impact on a Human Level of the Sonoma Case | 5 | Little or no discussion on how the Sonoma Case impacts both the Plaintiff and migrant children in California. (0-3 points) | Discussion evident but lacks depth. Demonstrates limited awareness of how school policy can impact children from linguistically diverse backgrounds. (4 points) | Clearly and succinctly identifies potential policy effects of the case on the child beyond academics. Anticipates and discusses negative impact on migrant families. (5 points) |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS IN THIS AREA Overall, 90 per cent fell in the EXEMPLARY RESPONSE area indicating their excellent grasp of issues facing families and the roles of educational access and equity in the educational process. Ten per cent fell in the ADEQUATE RESPONSE area. Overall, well done. | | | | |

Another key facet assessed was students’ knowledge of the broad implications of political-legal decisions on human actors, specifically students and families. Following the three level rubric (weak, adequate, exemplary), all students met or exceeded expectations, with the overwhelming majority (90%) scoring “Exemplary” and the rest (10%) scoring “Adequate”.

| Plan Element | Maximum Points | Weak Response | Adequate Response | Exemplary Response |
|--|----------------|--|--|--|
| Legal Resources/Assistance | 5 | Identification/discussion of potential resources/assistance that school administration could consult relating to resolution of the case is very limited and/or vague. (0-3 points) | At least four sources of assistance are outlined and a brief discussion accompanies each. (4 points) | Five or more sources of assistance are outlined and a clear discussion is included of how each can function as a resource for school administration in addressing the case. (5 points) |
| SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS IN THIS AREA Majority of student (70 per cent) fell in the ADEQUATE RESPONSE area with the rest falling in the WEAK RESPONSE area reflecting their limited understanding of legal considerations as they relate to policy. | | | | |

Students were assessed as well on their knowledge of how to employ legal resources to assist and advocate on behalf of schools. Based on the three level rubric, overall student performance indicated understanding of this element to be “Adequate” (70%), with the rest scoring “Weak” (30%).

| Plan Element | Maximum Points | Weak Response | Adequate Response | Exemplary Response |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Implications of the | 5 | Little or no discussion | Brief discussion is | Clear and well- |

| | | | | |
|---|----|--|---|--|
| Sonoma Case on School Policy | | included in analysis/discussion pertaining to potential impact of Sonoma case on school policy. (0-3 points) | included with short-term effects identified. (4 points) | articulated analysis /discussion are evident. Both short and long-term effects are identified and discussed in depth. (5 points) |
| <p>SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS IN THIS AREA</p> <p>Ninety per cent of students fell in the ADEQUATE RESPONSE area, again reflecting their limited understanding of how educational policy can have far-reaching implications for school governance and law. The remaining 10 per cent fell into the WEAK RESPONSE area.</p> | | | | |
| TOTAL | 35 | (0-19 points) | (28-27 points) | (32-35 points) |