**2019-2020 Annual Program Assessment Report Guide (Elementary Education)**

Please submit your report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean and Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by **September 30, 2020**. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name. Please do not change the date on the form, and be sure to check that your report is ADA accessible.**

**College:** Michael D. Eisner College of Education

**Department:** Elementary Education

**Program:** Master of Arts in Education: Curriculum and Instruction option, Language & Literacy option, Multicultural-Multilingual option

**Assessment liaison: Mira Pak**

**Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Participated in the 2019-20 assessment of General Education Section D: Social Sciences and U.S. History and Government student learning outcomes**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:

* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the GE learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include: e.g. SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes) and the creation or modification of new assessment instruments

**2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).**

The Department of Elementary Education (EED) assesses our candidates’ ability, at program end, to reflect on their own pedagogy by examining their practice to support diverse students’ learning needs (SLO 1). Students have the option to take either the portfolio-based Comprehensive Exam or to complete a thesis.

We wanted to examine how our M.A. candidates performed in the Comprehensive Exam across the three options (Curriculum & Instruction, Literacy & Language, and Multicultural-Multilingual) in SLO 1 because: a) it is an important and timely topic, and b) we hypothesized that with the Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) cohort taught largely by adjunct faculty, their scores in this area might be lower than students’ scores in the other program options.

For the purposes of this assessment report, we extracted the Fall 2019 Comp. Exam scores measuring SLO 1 for all students in these three program options. Since the students can choose to take either the Comp. Exam or write a thesis, students choosing the Comp. Exam enroll in EED 697; these scores are from that class. The prompts and scoring rubric are the same across the options since the Comp. Exam is administered in the one course. We then calculated the mean SLO 1 score for each option. These calculations will allow for cross-program comparison as well as intra-program comparison with future cohorts; however, the student numbers in each cohort are not even. That is because other students could and did choose the thesis option.

We have not yet met in our program faculty groups to review the candidates’ Comp. Exam scores. But it will most likely come as a surprise that the group that scored the highest mean was the C&I group, the cohort that was predicted to score the lowest. Of course, the question we will explore is “Why?” Of note is the fact that the majority of the L&L and M&M students chose to write a thesis, so the numbers from those programs who took the Comp. Exam were lower than the students in C&I. Students who choose the Comp. Exam are often students who are actively avoiding the task of writing a thesis and prefer the Comp Exam’s format instead. All of the students in the C&I program chose the Comp. Exam over the thesis, mostly because the preparation for the Comp. Exam is shorter than it is for writing a thesis..

This assessment activity reflects the University’s commitment to diversity and underrepresented groups because our MA candidates are almost all local K-6 teachers in diverse classrooms with large populations of underrepresented minority pupils and English Learners. This SLO rubric directly assesses candidates’ ability to examine their own teaching and supporting of diverse pupil populations. Improving our candidates’ awareness of their own pedagogy when it comes to all students’ learning needs and how to meet them is designed to improve the educational outcomes of all their students, especially those for their underrepresented pupils.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **# of students** | **Comp Exam SLO 1 score\*** |
| **C&I** | 15 | 3.8 |
| **L&L** | 4 | 3.5 |
| **M&M** | 6 | 3.5 |
| **Total** | 25 |  |

**\*Rubric scores: 1 (unsatisfactory) – 4 (strong)**

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for 2020-21.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

The results will be analyzed by all program faculty and discussed in three venues: program faculty meetings, the EED MA Committee, and an EED department meeting, for cross-program option comparison. We will also look at the optional comments that scorers could add, and we will re-visit the limitations of the rubric. In all three venues, we will consider program modifications that address the results and are expected to increase program impact on SLO 1. This is necessary since we are starting the M.A. program elevation.