

# College of Education

## Assessment Year-End Report

### 2010-11

---



#### Overview

The following report provides the university with information and updates on assessment activities in the College of Education in 2010-11. This report reviews our main activities and accomplishments for the academic year just past before concluding with next steps as we continue to develop and refine our unit assessment system.

#### Activities and Accomplishments

The 2010-11 academic year was the third 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.

#### Unit Assessment System (UAS) Evaluation

In Fall 2010, the college conducted an evaluation of its UAS. Faculty members from across the college and affiliated programs were asked to complete an 11-item, online survey related to their awareness of and engagement with the UAS, as well as the value and effectiveness of the system. Our best estimate is that 174 individuals received a group email asking them to complete the survey, with 102 total responses (a response rate of approximately 58%).

The Assessment Committee discussed the data over the course of two meetings in Spring 2011. Findings indicated that most respondents are aware of and have been engaged with the assessment system. While the data suggest some find the assessment process authentic and valuable, others continue to see it as a burden unrelated to the teaching and learning process. Comments also suggest that the Assessment Office can more effectively communicate regarding the implementation process, as well as how the system the college is using relates to mandatory statewide assessments like the CalTPAs and other reporting efforts in the college. The results of the UAS evaluation can be found online at: <https://www.ced.csulb.edu/assessment/uas-evaluation-fall-2010>

#### Exit Survey for Advanced Programs

In spring 2011, the college administered the third iteration of its exit survey for students in advanced programs. Invitations were sent to a total of 563 individuals, with 194 (34 percent) completing the survey. The survey 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, six programs opted to have their graduating candidates complete program-specific survey questions as well.

These data have been analyzed and will be shared with individual programs for inclusion in the next round of annual reports.

## Teaching Performance Assessment

This past year was the third full year of 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, approximately 5006 regular task submissions and 690 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 third time to ensure reliability. The process has placed a significant burden on faculty in the Single and Multiple Subject programs, since the professors teaching the courses in which each task is administered manage the logistics of helping students submit the tasks and then score the tasks – which can be 20 to 40 pages long each.

The 2010-11 academic year marked the first time the college paid assessors for participating in the CalTPA scoring. The ability to pay assessors gave the college the opportunity to expand the assessor pool to individuals not teaching the related courses. In addition, the college moved to a more centralized process for coordinating assessors, with that work now being done through the Assessment Office, which already coordinates the scoring process.

Finally, in summer 2011, the college implemented a recalibration process for all assessors. Each assessor is expected to recalibrate annually on one or more tasks to remain eligible to score the task(s). Assessors have two options for the recalibration process. They may choose to recalibrate using an online process created by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing or they may elect to recalibrate using an in-house process developed by the college. While the process is ongoing, of the 136 assessors calibrated at the start of the summer, approximately 100 have recalibrated successfully, none have attempted to recalibrate but have not succeeded, and 20 have informed us they will not be attempting to recalibrate. Individuals who do not succeed in recalibrating will have the option of attending training in September and recalibrating in that way.

## Revised Reporting Schedule

The college has shifted its reporting schedule. In prior years, degree-only programs had a report due each May. In 2010-11, the Assessment Committee elected to have all program reports due each December. Therefore, degree-only programs did not complete an annual report in May 2011; this means that the university will receive annual reports only for credential programs, which prepared reports in fall 2010. Degree-only programs will be submitting an annual report to the college in December 2011, and those reports (which will cover all data since their last reports) will be forwarded to the university in summer 2012.

The table below provides a summary of which reports will be submitted (as indicated by an “x” in fall 2011):

Degree Program/Option	Report Status
Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Master of Arts in Education	-
Educational Administration	x
Educational Psychology	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Educational Technology	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012

<b>Degree Program/Option</b>	<b>Report Status</b>
Curriculum & Instruction (Secondary and Elementary)	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Dual Language Development	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Early Childhood Education	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Reading and Language Arts	X
Mathematics Education	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Librarianship	X
Social and Cultural Analysis of Education	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Master of Science in Special Education	X
Master of Science in Counseling	-
Marriage and Family Therapy	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
School Counseling	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Student Development in Higher Education	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
EdD in Educational Leadership	Not submitted; next submission in Fall 2012
Affiliated Programs	
Adapted Physical Education	X
School Nurse	X
School Social Work	X
Speech and Language Pathology	X
Initial Credential Programs	
Designated Subjects	X
Multiple Subject	X
Single Subject	X

### **Data Collection and Management**

Data management continues to be a challenge for the college. The assessment system collects data on the performance of each student on signature assignments, including not just a final grade but also scores on rubric-level criteria. To date, with the exception of students in the three programs that use TaskStream (Multiple and Single Subject, Early Childhood Education), we have collected these data using custom-designed Excel spreadsheets. While workable, this system is far from efficient in terms of both data *collection* and *management*.

The college has been working to develop a custom database (named “Nautilus”) for assessment and for our information management system as a whole. In spring 2011, the college underwent an extensive “gap analysis” with support and leadership from Academic Technology Services (ATS). Each office in the college identified its needs for the database and an external consultant has provided a broad “roadmap” that can be used to guide the development of the database. The college and ATS are now digesting the report from the consultant and considering options in terms of costs and logistics.

### **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, state and national standards, allows us to aggregate overall student performance on program learning outcomes around our college's Conceptual Framework and NCATE standards. The data for 2010-11 are reflected in the table titled: Program-level Summary Table by College Conceptual Framework Key Ideas

At the time of this report, the college Assessment Committee has not yet reviewed and interpreted these data. However, the data appear to indicate strong overall performance for students related to each of the college's six areas on the conceptual framework.

**Program-level Summary Table by College Conceptual Framework Key Ideas (AY10-11)**  
(Scores on 0-4 Scale)

**Program-level Summary Table by College Conceptual Framework Key Ideas (AY 10-11)**  
(Scores on 0-4 Scale)

Program Names	Promotes Growth & Learning		Prepares Socially Responsible Leaders		Values Diversity		Service & Collaboration		School Improvement		Research & Evaluation	
	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N	Average	N
<b>Initial Teacher Preparation</b>												
Designated Subjects	3.69	29	3.90	29	3.58	12	3.35	17	3.30	123	3.38	56
Education Specialist I	3.39	212	3.87	39	3.87	39	3.44	18	3.36	135	3.35	145
Multiple Subject	3.53	1174	n/a		3.65	971	3.48	668			3.65	232
Single Subject	3.70	828			3.55	761	3.68	334	3.55	761	3.52	741
<b>Advanced Teacher Preparation</b>												
Adapted Physical Education	3.60	10	3.50	10	3.64	11	3.50	10	3.35	21	3.60	10
Curriculum and Instruction	3.63	160	3.69	58	3.92	51	3.67	192	3.70	211	3.85	100
Dual Language Development	3.79	88	3.75	88	3.71	120	3.63	70	3.55	85	3.69	103
Early Childhood Education	3.77	118	3.74	90	3.69	201	3.82	66	3.71	68	3.91	45
Education Specialist II (includes MS)	3.75	32	3.55	94	3.31	54	3.85	34	3.22	82	3.60	54
<b>Other School Professionals</b>												
Administrative Services I (include MA)	3.74	23	3.81	79	3.69	45	3.85	40	3.79	68	3.61	23
Administrative Services II												
Educational Technology	3.47	169	3.65	23	3.65	23	3.04	23	3.04	23	3.62	21
Library Media Teacher (includes MA)	n/a	0	3.72	18	3.73	33	3.72	18	n/a	0	3.83	40
Reading and Language Arts (includes MA)	3.80	10	n/a	0	n/a	0	3.77	13	n/a	0	n/a	0
School Counseling (includes MS)	3.59	26	3.75	58	3.67	48	3.19	16	3.81	16		
School Psychology			3.16	18	4.00	20	4.00	20	3.77	54	3.46	74
Speech-Language Pathology (CRS)												
<b>Non-NCATE</b>												
Counseling (Core)	3.79	52	3.34	202	3.39	312	3.51	110	3.68	196	3.68	196
Educational Psychology	3.93	45	3.72	36	3.90	30	n/a	0	3.90	30	3.60	209
Liberal Studies												
Marriage and Family Therapy	3.66	96	3.59	29	3.64	125	3.59	29				
School Nurse	4.00	24	3.58	24	3.67	12	4.00	12	3.69	13	3.77	13
School Social Work			3.73	92	3.63	46	3.73	92	3.46	46	3.61	46
Social and Cultural Analysis of Education	3.53	160	3.68	68	3.74	68	3.52	137	3.68	68	3.45	161
Student Development in Higher Education	3.48	78	3.50	4	3.50	4	3.69	26	3.69	26	3.07	61
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3334</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>1059</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>2986</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>1945</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>2330</b>

Note:

Data for credential programs is based on candidate performance in the courses offered in *Summer 10, Fall 10, Spring 11*.

Data for degree-only programs is based on candidate performance in the courses offered in *Spring 10, Summer 10, Fall 10, Spring 11*.

Shaded area means the key idea(s) are not directly measured in that program.

Blank, unshaded area means the course in which that outcome is assessed was not offered during *Ay 10-11*.

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

## **Next Steps in 2011-12**

The college will continue to implement the full program assessment and improvement process. In 2011-12, the following will be among the most significant activities and next steps.

### **UAS Evaluation Presentation and Next Steps**

In October 2011, the Assessment Coordinator will be presenting to the college on the UAS evaluation last fall. This presentation will focus on the major findings of the survey, but also the concrete next steps the Assessment Committee plans to respond to the feedback shared by faculty. Future efforts will be focused on:

- helping faculty differentiate between high-stakes, mandated assessments and the faculty-owned assessment system in the college;
- communicating how assessment work is integrated with the goals and mission of the college;
- finding a ways to involve and engage more part-time faculty in the assessment process; and,
- helping faculty identify ways to take credit for their assessment work in the RTP process.

### **Updated Mapping of SLOs to New Conceptual Framework and University SLOs**

In spring 2011, the College of Education revised its conceptual framework, articulating new elements to give depth and context to its mission. These conceptual framework elements provide the basis for aggregating signature assignment data, as shown in the table above. Therefore, each program will be mapping its existing SLOs to the new conceptual framework elements in fall 2011.

Also, in spring 2011, the college assessment coordinator met with the campus assessment coordinator to discuss campus needs for WASC reporting. The campus would like see assessment information reported from the college in a more streamlined manner which links the data collected by signature assignments. The college assessment committee reviewed this request and agreed on the following course of action:

- All programs in the college will be asked to map their learning outcomes to the university learning objectives (at the same time they map to the new elements of the conceptual framework)
- Starting with data from fall 2011, the college Assessment Office will then aggregate SLO data around the university learning objectives in the same way data are aggregated around NCATE standards and conceptual framework elements.
- In fall 2012, the Assessment Committee will review and discuss this aggregated data from 2011-12. The college assessment coordinator will prepare a 1-2 page summary of the discussion and forward this to the campus assessment coordinator along with program annual reports and an annual report from the college. This report will be submitted by October 1, 2012.

## **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.