College of Education
Assessment Year-End Report
Fall 2013 – Fall 2014

Overview

The following report provides the university with information and updates on assessment activities in the College of Education from fall 2013 through fall 2014. This report reviews our main activities and accomplishments for this period, concluding with next steps as we continue to develop and refine our unit assessment system.

Activities and Accomplishments

The 2013-14 academic year was the sixth year of the full implementation of the revised unit assessment system (UAS) for the College of Education and Affiliated Programs. The UAS is designed to collect and use data on student performance and program effectiveness at both the college and program levels to support student learning and success. The college has an assessment system that provides guidance and support to our diverse array of programs while allowing for faculty-ownership of the process and the content of assessment at the program level.

Staffing Changes

The Assessment Office experienced significant staffing changes in 2014. In March, Keeley Lewis was hired as assessment analyst, the college's first full-time professional staff in the Assessment Office. Her hiring reflects ongoing, significant investment by the college in assessment, and is part of an effort to institutionalize and professionalize support for assessment in the college. In addition, Brenda Gallegos was hired as office coordinator, replacing the individual who had held the position for nearly 7 years. Finally, Ali Rezaei, a professor in the ASEC department, was identified as assessment coordinator-designee. Dr. Rezaei will step into his new role in fall 2015.

Advanced Programs Exit Survey

In spring 2014, the college administered the fifth iteration of its exit survey for students in advanced programs. Invitations were sent to a total of 373 individuals, with 162 (43 percent) completing the survey. The survey, which was revised in fall 2013 to better align it with other college surveys, consisted of items related to advising, candidate perceptions of faculty use of technology, candidate self-reported gains in knowledge and skills related to our conceptual framework, and the value of educational experiences related to diversity. In addition, 7 programs opted to have their graduating candidates complete program-specific survey questions as well.

These data were analyzed and shared with individual programs in fall 2014 for inclusion in the biennial reports. The college Assessment Committee reviewed college-wide survey results and used them to inform program improvement efforts at the college level.

Advanced Programs Alumni Survey

In fall 2013, college administered its first college-wide survey to alumni of advanced programs in the college. In fall 2012, the Assessment Committee established a 3-year cycle for surveying alumni of all advanced programs, with a common "core" survey received by all alumni and programs able to add program-specific questions if they wished. The initial survey was sent to 1,869 alumni (those who

graduated between 2009 and 2012); 13% of the sample responded. Results of this survey were shared with individual programs in spring 2014

Student Satisfaction Surveys

In spring 2013, the college administered two surveys (one for Liberal Studies and one for post-baccalaureate and graduate students) to assess the satisfaction of students *currently* enrolled in the college. These surveys were developed in the context of the university's *Highly Valued Degree Initiative* and the administration process has been described in a prior report. Aggregate data were reviewed by the college student success committee, while program-level data were shared with programs in fall 2013 for use in program improvement.

CSU Exit Survey (Initial Programs)

This survey is administered by the CSU Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) for students completing teaching credential programs. The survey covers several aspects of teacher preparation including; advising, diversity, quality of courses, programs , and instruction, course availability, and graduate preparation for teaching. The Assessment Office extracted data collected on 1140 single subject, 940 multiple subject, 205 special education students that graduated from 2009-2013 from the College of Education. Data was organized, analyzed, and presented to the Assessment Committee and the 3 initial program coordinators.

Teaching Performance Assessment

The Assessment Office continues to administer high-stakes assessments known as the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA). Candidates in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs must pass four discrete assessments, in addition to completing other requirements, to be recommended for a teaching credential

Since July 2008, and through spring 2013, approximately 10,191 regular task submissions and 1,688 resubmissions have been completed by students (this figure counts a single student multiple times, since a student completes multiple tasks and may have had to repeat one or more tasks multiple times). Tasks are scored by assessors (faculty) who have been trained and are calibrated on the particular task. Each task is scored at least once, with those that receive a failing grade scored a second and possibly a third time to ensure reliability.

In summer 2014, the college conducted a fourth round of annual recalibration for all assessors. Each assessor must recalibrate annually on one or more tasks to remain eligible to score the task(s). All assessors were asked to recalibrate using the online process developed by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Individuals who do not succeed in recalibrating have the option of attending training in September and recalibrating in that way.

Advanced Programs Employer Focus Groups

In spring and fall 2014, the college conducted a series of focus groups with employers of graduates of our advanced programs as a way to examine how employers perceive the quality of preparation our graduates have received. In total, 17 different employers (each employing 3 or more recent graduates) participated in focus groups. The focus groups revealed satisfaction with the overall preparation of our graduates for their professional work, but also raised questions about the relevance of all aspects of the college's Conceptual Framework for individual programs (this latter topic is being taken up by Faculty Council and the Assessment Committee). The process of data collection also provided important lessons for future studies.

Started Signature Assignment Review and Calibration

In fall 2014, the college started to implement an ongoing process for programs to review and calibrate on signature assignments. The goal of this process is to ensure that signature assignments are timely and up to date, and that there is consistency of grading in line with program expectations. Program faculty participated in the *Beyond Compliance* workshop (see below), and during a portion of the workshop they reviewed and calibrated on one of the program's signature assignments. In the months since, we have developed supporting materials for review and calibration, outlined the process, and articulated a plan for rolling out this more formal process in fall 2015. In spring 2015, the Assessment Office worked with Teacher Education programs that had asked for further work with review and calibration.

1st Annual *Beyond Compliance* Workshop

In spring 2015, the Assessment Committee asked the Dean to provide a regular forum to support faculty work and professional development around assessment; she agreed to do so. Thus, in September 2014, the Assessment Office hosted the college's first annual *Beyond Compliance* workshop. The half-day event had 74 participants from the college and our affiliated programs, as well as several guests from CSULB and area CSU campuses. After an overview of the new biennial reporting format, faculty worked in program groups to review two-years of SLO and survey data – as the foundation for the biennial reports. At the end of the day, they engaged in the calibration exercise described above.

The *Beyond Compliance* workshop will be offered each year, with topics and formats changing to reflect the emerging needs of our assessment system.

Updated Assessment Office Web Site

In summer 2014, the Assessment Office conducted a major overhaul of its web site. The content was updated to reflect the current state of our assessment work, and the number of links and pages was streamlined. Most significantly, the page providing all assessment documents for each program was reorganized for easier use.

Program Biennial Reports

During the period of this report, important substantive and scheduling changes were made to assessment reporting in the college. First, the Assessment Committee voted to recommend to the Dean, and the Dean concurred, that programs should move from annual assessment reports to biennial reports. This decision was made to take advantage of the university's move to a biennial reporting schedule and to reflect the reporting schedule for CCTC programs in the college.

Second, and concurrently, the college revised the biennial report template completed by programs. These revisions had several goals:

- To encourage programs to better reflect on and articulate how results are changing over time;

- To help programs make a more explicit link between interpretation of data and planned actions for program improvement;

- To reduce the amount of writing programs had to do and to help them focus on action.

The college also consulted with CCTC and received approval to use the new report template for our CCTC biennial reports – resulting in a single, common report format for all programs in the college.

Third, the Assessment Office conducted a major revision of data charts and tables given to programs. The shift to biennial report required that we modify data charts to reflect *trend* data across multiple years. CCTC also asked that we break out pathway data for programs with multiple pathways. The result

was a more complicated data reporting process as well as more data charts, but also data charts that allow faculty to more easily see data trends and to compare results across pathways.

In November and December 2014, all programs in the college submitted their biennial assessment reports (based on data from the 2012-2014 academic years). The table below provides a summary of the fall 2014 reports submitted as part of this report to the university. "X" indicates the report is part of the bundle of documents forwarded to the university.

Degree Program/Option	Report Status
Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies	X
Master of Arts in Education	
Educational Administration	X
Educational Psychology	X
Educational Technology	X
Curriculum & Instruction (Secondary and Elementary)	X
Dual Language Development	X
Early Childhood Education	X
Reading and Language Arts	Not active
Mathematics Education	X
Librarianship	X
Social and Cultural Analysis of Education	X
Master of Science in Special Education	X
Master of Science in Counseling	
Marriage and Family Therapy	X
School Counseling	X
Student Development in Higher Education	X
Educational Specialist in School Psychology	X
EdD in Educational Leadership	X
Affiliated Programs	
Adapted Physical Education	X
School Nurse	Not active
School Social Work	X
Speech and Language Pathology	X
Initial Credential Programs	-
Education Specialist – Preliminary	X
Multiple Subject	X
Single Subject	X

Data Collection and Reporting Exploration

As past reports have noted, data management continues to be a challenge for the college. With the exception of students in the three programs that use TaskStream (Multiple and Single Subject, Early Childhood Education), we collect these data using custom-designed Excel spreadsheets, a system that is workable but far from efficient in terms of data *collection*, *management, and reporting*.

Thus, in fall 2013, the Assessment Office collaborated with Academic Technology Services (ATS) to explore the possibility of using BeachBoard to collect signature assignment data. Three programs (SDHE, Ed Tech, and Ed Specialist) participated in the pilot, Signature Assignment rubrics were developed in BeachBoard so that faculty could score and input criteria-level data directly into BeachBoard and the Assessment Office could then pull down the data from BeachBoard without sending faculty Excel worksheets.

Individually and collectively, the college and ATS agreed that the use of BeachBoard was not sustainable and that it did not meet the needs of the college. The pilot revealed that there were numerous steps involved to set-up BeachBoard in a way that would allow us to collect signature assignment data and these steps created a substantial burden for both ATS and Assessment Office staff. Moreover, we also learned that it was not possible for the Assessment Office to get data out of BeachBoard in a way that met our needs.

In fall 2014, the assessment team traveled to San Diego State University to see how their College of Education uses the *Tableau* reporting software. During this meeting and a subsequent online meeting in spring 2015, the team determined that the software has significant potential to help with reporting needs; we must now assess implications in terms of cost, training, and infrastructure needs before committing to adopting the software.

Thus, at this writing, the search continues for software that will help us better collect, manage, and report student learning outcomes data.

Data Collection, Use and Reporting at the College Level

All the final scores for signature assignments collected at the program level are converted to a 0-4 score (reflecting the traditional A-F grading scale). This conversion, together with the fact that each program learning outcome is mapped to college, university, state and national standards, allows us to aggregate overall student performance on program learning outcomes around each of those standards. The data for 2012-13 and 2013-14 are reflected in the tables below titled (respectively):

- Program-level Summary Table by CSULB Learning Outcomes 2013-14

- Program-level Summary Table by College Conceptual Framework Key Ideas 2013-14

The college Assessment Committee reviewed and interpreted these data in fall 2014. The data indicate strong overall performance for students related to the CSULB outcomes as well as each of the college's six areas on the conceptual framework.

In the case of the CSULB outcomes, data are presented clustered by degree offered, with subgroup averages where multiple program options exist within a given degree. As noted above, the college also breaks out averages for specific program pathways. As a whole, the mean scores for the college on each CSULB are well above 3.0, suggesting students are performing at a strong level related to each of the five university outcomes. As was the case the last two years, *Knowledge and Respect for Diversity* has the highest level of performance.

Across degrees, performance on the CSULB outcomes is similarly strong, with a few exceptions. Liberal Studies has scores below 3. 0 on *Well-Prepared* and on *Collaborative Problem Solving*. Since this is below

the college threshold of 3.0, the Assessment Committee asked for the chair to explore why this might be the case. There was agreement, as in past years, that since Liberal Studies is an undergraduate program, a lower average score might not be uncommon. The chair also noted that one of the signature assignments mapped to these standards is in an introductory course, which might mean students are performing more poorly than they would at the end of the program.

In the case of the college's Conceptual Framework, the performance across the college is equally strong and consistent, with *Advocacy* as the strongest element. The same is true at the program level.

Program-level Summary Table by CSULB Learning Outcomes (AY13-14)
Degree Programs Only
(Scores on 0-4 Scale)

DegreeType	Well-prepared		Engaged in Global and Local Issues		Knowledge and Respect for Diversity		Integrating Liberal Education		Collaborative Problem Solving	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
B.A										
Liberal Studies	2.73	173	3.05	37	3.05	37	-	-	2.13	61
M.A in Education										
Administrative Services I (include MA)	3.97	32	3.74	35	3.49	45	3.89	56	3.63	90
On-Campus Cohort	3.97	32	3.59	17	3.70	20	3.83	48	3.63	40
South Bay Cohort	n/o		3.89	18	3.32	25	4.00	8	3.64	50
Curriculum and Instruction	3.00	21	3.88	25	3.88	25	3.71	14	3.36	47
Dual Language Development	N < 5		3.96	23	3.54	39	N < 5		3.13	16
Early Childhood Education	3.88	48	3.97	35	3.97	35	3.83	18	3.76	34
Educational Psychology	n/o		N < 5		N < 5		3.48	97	3.48	97
Educational Technology and Media Leadership	3.48	97	3.51	58	3.68	45	3.59	125	3.47	137
Math Education	3.88	36	3.93	26	3.95	30	n/o		3.71	34
Reading and Language Arts (includes MA)	n/o		n/o		n/o		n/o		n/o	
Social and Cultural Analysis of Education	3.83	102	3.79	68	3.79	68	3.80	102	3.81	68
Sub-Group Average	3.72	368	3.81	305	3.70	332	3.77	468	3.56	613
M.S. in Special Education										
Education Specialist II	3.52	32	3.54	24	4.00	24	3.54	13	3.83	12
M.S in Counseling										
Marriage and Family Therapy	3.47	55	3.59	27	3.48	27	3.47	55	3.48	27
School Counseling (includes MS)	4.00	16	4.00	14	4.00	30	4.00	36	4.00	28
Student Development in Higher Education	3.68	75	3.88	50	-	-	3.68	75	3.75	24
Sub-Group Average	3.72	146	3.82	91	3.74	57	3.72	166	3.74	79
Doctoral										
Ed.D in Educational Leadership	3.31	48	3.49	43	3.58	43	3.40	42	2.70	23
Higher Education Specialization	3.46	24	3.41	22	3.64	22	3.41	22	2.55	11
PK-12 Specialization	3.17	24	3.57	21	3.52	21	3.40	20	2.83	12
Total	3.56	735	3.72	465	3.70	448	3.67	508	3.45	698

Note: Data is based on candidate performance in the courses offered in *Summer 13, Fall 13, Spring 14.*

Average in the "Total" row is computed as a simple mean of program averages.

N reflects the number of signature assignments related to that standard. This may include data from one or more outcomes/signature assignments.

MSCP data: We did not have accurate data on the pathway for each student at the time data were collected; therefore, pathway numbers on this report do not match actual enrollment. Also, the Total N is greater than the sum of the individual pathways. This is due to incomplete pathway data made available for reporting

LEGEND	
"n/o"	= The course in which the outcome is assessed was not offered during *AY13-14*
"-"	= Data not submitted
*	= Program collects and analyzes qualitatve data
N < 5	= Total N reported equals less than 5. Data are not reported to protect against risk of identifying students

Program-level Summary Table by College Conceptual Framework Key Ideas (AY13-14)
(Scores on 0-4 Scale)

Program Names	Effective Pedagogy		Evidence-based Practices		Collaboration		Leadership		Innovation		Scholarship		Advocacy	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
Initial Teacher Preparation														
Education Specialist I	3.33	36	3.41	99	3.49	63	3.63	35	3.63	35	3.54	48	3.96	71
Multiple Subject	3.71	842	3.77	415	3.88	373	3.89	255	3.58	151	3.67	435	3.82	393
ITEP	3.70	367	3.75	137	3.91	143	3.94	72	3.49	78	3.71	149	3.83	141
5th year/Post-Baccaleaureate	3.72	239	3.76	133	3.86	135	3.88	96	3.66	32	3.71	135	3.79	129
UTEACH -- Post-Baccalaureate	3.69	61	3.78	34	3.90	23	3.80	22	3.67	12	3.51	36	3.78	34
UTEACH -- Undergraduate	3.66	108	3.79	60	3.83	36	3.83	36	3.67	24	3.54	61	3.87	59
Single Subject	3.59	256	3.75	700	3.49	380	3.49	380	3.76	500	3.49	380	3.49	380
Traditional	3.46	209	3.66	541	3.32	366	3.32	366	3.68	410	3.32	366	3.32	366
Advanced Teacher Preparation														
Adapted Physical Education	4.00	11	3.58	58	3.49	47	3.73	11	4.00	11	3.73	11	3.50	24
Curriculum and Instruction	n/o	n/o	3.33	34	3.36	47	3.78	27	3.36	47	3.00	21	3.88	25
Dual Language Development	N < 5	N < 5	N < 5	N < 5	3.13	16	N < 5	N < 5	N < 5	N < 5	3.96	23	3.96	23
Early Childhood Education	3.81	32	3.85	49	3.76	34	3.76	34	3.81	32	3.89	34	3.86	52
Math Education	3.81	56	3.97	42	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	3.71	34	3.93	26	4.00	12
Education Specialist II (includes MS)	3.56	9	3.56	9	3.83	12	3.48	23	3.48	23	3.54	13	3.54	24
Other School Professionals														
Administrative Services I (include MA)	3.90	40	3.78	45	3.49	45	3.86	61	4.00	16	3.88	16	3.74	35
On-Campus Cohort	3.90	40	3.55	20	3.70	20	3.74	36	4.00	16	3.75	8	3.59	17
South Bay Cohort	n/o	n/o	3.96	25	3.32	25	3.96	25	n/o	n/o	4.00	8	3.89	18
Administrative Services II	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o
Ed.D in Educational Leadership	3.58	43	3.40	42	3.49	43	3.31	48	3.31	48	2.70	23	3.58	43
Higher Education Specialization	3.64	22	3.41	22	3.41	22	3.46	24	3.46	24	2.55	11	3.64	22
PK-12 Specialization	3.52	21	3.40	20	3.57	21	3.17	24	3.17	24	2.83	12	3.52	21
Educational Technology and Media Leadership	3.52	93	3.49	146	3.60	58	3.70	23	3.10	21	3.57	81	3.67	9
Reading and Language Arts (includes MA)	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o
School Counseling (includes MS)	-	-	4.00	14	4.00	38	4.00	36	4.00	14	4.00	16	4.00	52
School Psychology	3.59	41	3.89	41	3.69	45	3.68	40	3.64	47	n/o	n/o	3.80	44
Speech-Language Pathology (CRS)	3.98	44	3.98	44	4.00	43	4.00	21	3.95	22	4.00	15	4.00	43
Traditional	3.98	44	3.98	44	4.00	43	4.00	21	3.95	22	4.00	15	4.00	43
Cohort	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o
Non-NCATE														
Counseling (Core)	3.72	99	3.72	152	3.72	99	3.62	225	3.59	46	3.59	46	3.40	78
Educational Psychology	N < 5	N < 5	3.48	97	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	3.48	97	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o
Liberal Studies	*(shaded)*		*(shaded)*		*(shaded)*		*(shaded)*		*(shaded)*		2.73	173	*(shaded)*	
Marriage and Family Therapy	3.54	54	3.48	82	3.54	54	3.59	27	3.54	54	3.54	54	3.54	54
School Nurse	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o	n/o
School Social Work	3.93	15	3.97	30	3.73	30	3.87	30	3.97	30	3.83	30	3.73	45
Social and Cultural Analysis of Education	3.84	68	3.79	68	3.88	34	3.79	34	3.79	68	3.81	68	3.79	68
Student Development in Higher Education	4.00	26	3.88	50	3.28	25	3.75	24	3.88	50	-	-	3.68	75
Total	3.73	1765	3.70	2217	3.62	1486	3.72	1334	3.68	1346	3.60	1513	3.75	1550

Note:
Data is based on candidate performance in the courses offered in *Summer 13, Fall 13, Spring 14.*

Average in the "Total" row is computed as a simple mean of program averages.

N reflects the number of signature assignments related to that standard. This may include data from one or more outcomes/signature assignments.

MSCP data: We did not have accurate data on the pathway for each student at the time data were collected; therefore, pathway numbers on this report do not match actual enrollment. Also, the Total N is greater than the sum of the individual pathways. This is due to incomplete pathway data made available for reporting

LEGEND	
(shaded)	= Shaded area means the key idea(s) are not directly measured in that program.
"n/o"	= The course in which the outcome is assessed was not offered during *AY13-14*
"-"	= Data not submitted
*	= Program collects and analyzes qualitatve data
N < 5	= Total N reported equals less than 5. Data are not reported to protect against risk of identifying students

Next Steps Starting in Spring 2015

The college will continue to implement the full program assessment and improvement process. Moving forward, the following will be among the most significant activities and next steps:

- **UAS 2.0**: The current UAS was designed in 2007-08. In spring 2015, NCATE and CCTC will visit the college for our regular accreditation review. The preparation for this visit has led us to reflect on our assessment work and we also anticipate receiving useful feedback from our colleagues. In addition to this feedback, we expect to seek feedback from college faculty in fall 2015 by conducting an evaluation of our UAS (the last one was done in 2010). Taken together, we expect this reflection and feedback will help us identify next steps in the life of our UAS.

- **Strategic Planning**: Related to the above, we anticipate drafting a five-year strategic plan for assessment and the Assessment Office. The draft of the plan will be completed in spring 2015 but will likely be revised based on the feedback from accreditation and from faculty the following fall. At this point in the development of the UAS, we believe it is important to set clear priorities and articulate the resources needed for those priorities.

- **Data Collection and Management:** The college will continue its efforts to find technology that can effectively address our growing needs related to data collection, management, and reporting. Growing expectations from accreditors as well as authentic questions from faculty make this need all the more pressing.

- **Engaging Others in Assessment:** One clear area of growth for our assessment work is to be more intentional and sophisticated in how we engage individuals who are not full-time faculty in the assessment process. This includes community partners, part-time faculty and, of course, students themselves. Part of our strategic goals will be to find ways to expand and support faculty work in this area.

- **Review of and Calibration on Signature Assignments and Rubrics**: As noted above, we have developed guidelines and a process for program faculty to calibrate on their rubrics whenever they engage in data discussions, and we have piloted that process. Moving forward, the goal will be to roll out a process that is manageable and well-supported.

Conclusion

As this report suggests, the college is now focused on refining and extending our assessment practices and ensuring that faculty have the support they need to turn data into action. The college maintains its commitment to a robust, faculty-owned assessment system while also being mindful of the time and effort invested by faculty in today's challenging fiscal environment. Therefore, we will continue to seek ways to support faculty to make the best use of their time related to assessment: interpreting and acting on data to improve our programs and support our students.