**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-2021 AY will be due September  30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh ([douglasf@csufresno.edu](mailto:douglasf@csufresno.edu)).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also, be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program:  **Reading/Language Arts Program** Degree: **Master’s in Education**

Assessment Coordinator: **(Report submitted by Department Chair, Imelda Basurto)**

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.
   1. Outcome 1.1: Graduate students will be able to compare and contrast major theories of literacy and language development.
   2. Outcome 1.2:  Graduate students will be able to apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons.
   3. Outcome 2.1:  Design differentiated instructional strategies based on student assessment results.
2. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**
   1. Assessment 1: Theory to Practice Project (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2):  LEE 213 (Teaching Language Arts in Grades K-12) has primary responsibility for assessing these objectives using the Theory to Practice Project rubric (Attachment A).  *The LEE 213 Theory to Practice Project is* an inquiry project that has three main components. First, students select a topic of inquiry driven by their professional experiences teaching language arts and write a research paper describing the different theoretical perspectives and respective instructional implications. Second, students use the research examined to develop and implement instructional lessons in the classroom setting. Third, students develop a presentation to share with colleagues that presents the theory of their report, the practical applications from their lessons, and a critical reflection on the experiences.  The LEE 213 Theory to Practice Projects are evaluated on a 3.0 range: 3 is proficient, 2 is developing, and 1 is beginning, and even though there are two rubrics used for this assignment, the Theory to Practice Presentation Rubric results were used for this report.
3. Assessment 2:  Case Study Report (Outcomes 2.1):  In LEE 224 (Assessing & Developing Reading Abilities), students administer a variety of literacy assessments to an individual struggling reader in K-12, analyze the assessment results, and use the results to develop an individualized instructional plan. The students prepare a case study report that details the assessment tools and results, provides an analysis of the results, and provides instructional recommendations. Reports will be evaluated and scored using a *Case Study Rubric* (Attachment B) as exemplary (90-100), accomplished (80-89), developing (70-79), or beginning (below 70) based on the ability to administer, score, and analyze assessment tools and to use assessment results and literacy research to guide the design of differentiated instruction for struggling readers. A score of ≥ 80 is considered to have met the learning outcome. 75% of students are expected to meet the learning outcome.
4. Assessment 3: Comprehensive Exam (Outcomes: 1.1., 1.2, 2.1) LEE *298C Comprehensive Exam* is one of two culminating experience options, and the one most chosen by the graduate students in the program.  The Comp Exam assesses learning outcomes connected to the following core courses:  LEE 278, LEE 213, LEE 215, LEE 224, and LEE 244.   The core course faculty developed ten questions, two questions per course, which assess all outcomes related to that course; however, only five of the questions are used every examination period.  The 5 questions are randomly selected by the University’s Software Program, CANVAS.  Of the five questions selected by CANVAS, the graduate students choose three to answer. Question 1 is for LEE 215, question 2 is for LEE 213, question 3 is for LEE 244, question 4 is for LEE 224, and question 5 is for LEE 278.  The learning outcomes of every course are evaluated and scored using a 4-point *Comp Examination Rubric (*Attachment c).  A score of ≥ 2.0 is considered to have answered the question correctly.
5. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met the benchmark.
   1. Assessment 1: The LEE 213 Theory to Practice Projects are evaluated using 6 criteria (Context, Inquiry Focus & Rationale, Key Findings, Data Collection & Analysis, Findings, and Reflection) on a 3.0 range: 3 is “proficient”, 2 is “developing”, and 1 is “beginning.”  For this assessment, 80% of our graduate students are expected to be in the “developing” to “proficient” range. The evaluation results from the LEE 213 Theory to Practice Papers showed that of the 15 students, 60% (n=9) were identified as “proficient,”  40% (n=6) were identified as “developing,” and 0% (n=0) were identified as “beginning,”
   2. Assessment 2:  The LEE 224 Case Study was evaluated using 5 criteria (Results, Instruction, Analysis, Strengths/Weaknesses, Instructional Recommendations, and Writing Mechanics) on a 4.0 range: 4 being Exemplary, 3 being Accomplished, 3 being Developing, and 1 being Beginning.  For this assessment, 75% of our graduate students are expected to meet the learning outcome. The scoring results from the LEE 224 Case Study Rubric showed 100%  (n=13) reported their pre/post assessment results rated “exemplary; 100% (n=13) were rated “exemplary” for analysis; 100% (n=13) were rated as “exemplary” for strengths/weaknesses; 100% (n=13) were rated “exemplary” for instructional recommendations based on analysis and research;  96% (n=12) rated “exemplary” and 4% (n=1) rated “accomplished” for writing mechanics including APA.
   3. Assessment 3: The Comprehensive Exam was evaluated using 5 criteria (Accuracy of Information, Breadth of Knowledge, Application of Knowledge, Organization, Conventions) on a 4.0 range: 4 being Exemplary, 3 being Accomplished, 3 being Adequate, and 1 being Development.  For this assessment, 80% of our graduate students are expected to pass their exam on the first attempt and receive a score no lower than a 2 on their examination results. Of the 14 graduate students (n=14) that took the comp exams, eleven students passed Question 1, four students passed Question 2, nine passed Question 3, nine passed Question 4, and ten passed Question 5.  These questions were all passed at a 2.0 or above, resulting in a 100% passing rate for all questions. There were no retakes.

In reviewing the data, it was noticed that the graduate students did exceptionally well on Question 2 B (LEE 215b - What are the similarities, differences, and relationships between LI and L2 literacy development and interactions they cause in learning to read and comprehend in a second language?  How does that help you think about the education of English learners? Reference research and authors to support your answer), and Question 5B (LEE 278b – List and describe 4 classroom practices predominately taught by one particular theoretical paradigm (text, reader, interactive, or critical theory), and explain why it supports the theoretical foundation of that paradigm. Be sure to include an author, a theorist, and/or research for each practice.)  The overall rating scores of the 14 graduate students who took the comprehensive exam are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1:  2020-21 Comprehensive Examination Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Question 1 | | Question 2 | | Question 3 | | Question 4 | | Question 5 | |  |
| Student | LEE 213A | LEE 213B | LEE 215A | LEE 215B | LEE 224A | LEE 224B | LEE 244A | LEE 244B | LEE 278A | LEE 278B | Average (2 is passing) |
| 1  (ID 1 | 2.6 |  | 2.8 |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 2.73 |
| 2 (ID 15 |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.6 | 2.4 |  | 2.733 |
| 3 (ID 16 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 2.9 |  | 3.1 |  | 3 |
| 4 (ID 17 | 2.6 |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 2.93 |
| 5 (ID 12 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 | 3.33 |
| 6 (ID 2 | 2.6 |  | 2.3 |  |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  | 2.5 |
| 7 (ID (I3 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.2 |  | 2.7 |  |  | 2.8 |
| 8 (ID 4 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  | 3 |  | 3.23 |
| 9 (ID 5 | 2.4 |  |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2.73 |
| 10 (ID 6 |  | 2.4 |  |  | 2.9 |  | 2.7 |  |  |  | 2.66 |
| 11 (ID 7 |  | 2.4 |  |  | 2.1 |  |  |  | 3.2 |  | 2.56 |
| 12 (ID 8 |  |  |  |  | 3.2 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3.06 |
| 13 (ID 9 |  | 3.2 |  |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.2 |  |  | 3.33 |
| 14 (ID 10 |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2.7 |  | 3.13 |
| Average per Question | 2.68 | 2.94 | 2.56 | 3 | 2.82 | 3 | 2.91 | 3.16 | 2.91 | 3.8 | 2.91 |

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?
   1. Recommendations as a result of Assessment 1 (The Theory to Practice Presentation) Data: 1)  to examine the existing LEE 213 Theory to Practice Inquiry rubric and develop revisions that better capture the culturally and linguistically responsive practices we aim to develop in our candidates. Our goal is to pilot the revised rubric and coursework in the 2021-2022 academic year; and,  2) to make the rubric assessment more nuanced so that it capture’s how the candidates’ discuss their work environments.
2. Recommendations as a result of Assessment 2 (The Case Study Report) Data:  to add a category to the 224 Case Study rubric to include “Research” and require students to discuss the research behind the formal and informal assessments used in the Case Study assignment.
3. Recommendations as a result of Assessment 3 (Comprehensive Exam) Data: The program did not propose any recommendations for the comp exam rubric. However, the program wants to continue reviewing the expectations of the signature assignments and the comp exam questions to ensure that the program outcomes of these assignments are reflected in the passing scores of our graduates
4. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in that year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.
   1. The graduate students in LEE 244 were able to use a multi-media form for their literature review.  In addition, graduate students in this class were given an additional set of studies to analyze.
   2. The graduate students in LEE 213 were able to create a shared slideshow for their theory to practice presentations.
   3. The graduate students in LEE 224 were given additional practice to develop and support their  connections between assessment results, selection of instructional strategies, and connections to research.
5. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year (2021-2022)?
   1. *LEE 244 Literature Review for Comp or Project* (Outcome 1.1)
   2. *LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report* (Outcomes 1.2, 1.2)
   3. *Comprehensive Exam* (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)
6. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed?
   1. The Reading/Language Arts Program Faculty continues to execute the Closing the Loop Process outlined in its SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process the data from its signature assignments and program evaluation surveys are changed into information that enables all levels of the program’s system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports us in sustaining a program of high quality, which will be used for our next accreditation to be conducted in the spring of 2022.  It’s also important to note that there were no areas of improvement revealed in our last “national” accreditation cycle.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A:  LEE 213:     Theory to Practice Presentation Rubric

Attachment B:  LEE 224:     Case Study Report Rubric

Attachment C:  LEE 298C:   Comprehensive Exam Rubric

Attachment A

**LEE 213: Theory to Practice Inquiry Presentation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Component** | **3-Proficient** | **2-Developing** | **1-Beginning** |
| **Context**  (10 points) | • Includes specific details about research context (classroom, school, community)  • Uses specific evidence to support claims  **9-10 points** | • Includes general details about research context (classroom, school, community)  • Uses some evidence to support claims  **7-8 points** | • Includes little information about research context  • Uses little/no evidence to support claims  **0-6 points** |
| **Inquiry Focus & Rationale**  (10 points) | • Provides a specific definition of inquiry focus  • Clearly articulates rationale for inquiry focus  • Cites specific data to support rationale  **9-10 points** | • Provides a general definition of inquiry focus  • Articulates general rationale for inquiry focus  • Refers generally data to support rationale  **7-8 points** | • Missing definition of inquiry focus  • Missing rationale for inquiry focus  • Missing reference to data    **0-6 points** |
| **Key Findings from Literature**  (10 points) | • Provides concise overview of key points from research literature most relevant to inquiry  **9-10 points** | • Provides overview of key points from research literature, literature generally relevant to inquiry  **7-8 points** | • Provides overview of research literature, literature may not be relevant to inquiry OR literature overview may be missing  **0-6 points** |
| **Data Collection & Analysis**  (25 points) | • Clearly describes 3 iterations of data collected  • Provides specific rationale for collecting data  • Clearly articulates from whom data was collected and why  • Clearly describes tools used for analyzing data and rationale for using  • Clearly articulates process used for analyzing data  **23-25 points** | • Generally describes data collected  • Provides some rationale for collecting data  • Generally discusses from whom data was collected and why  • Generally describes tools used for analyzing data and rationale for using  • Generally articulates process used for analyzing data  **20-22 points** | • Provides little/no description of data collected  • Provides little/no rationale for collection of data  • Missing discussion of from whom data was collected and why  • Provides little/no description of tools used for analyzing data and rationale for using  • Provides little/no discussion of process used for analyzing data  **0-19 points** |
| **Findings**  (25 points) | • Clearly describes findings from data analysis  • Includes specific evidence from data to support findings  • Uses charts, tables, and/or graphs to help illustrate points and clearly explains graphics within narrative  **23-25 points** | • Generally describes findings from data analysis  • Includes general evidence from data to support findings  • Uses charts, tables, and/or graphs to help illustrate points; connection between graphics and narrative may not be clear  **20-22 points** | • Provides little/do description of findings from data analysis  • Missing evidence from data to support findings  • Uses no charts, tables, and/or graphs to help illustrate points OR charts, tables, graphs not appropriate  **0-19 points** |
| **Reflection & Next Steps**  (10 points) | • Includes thoughtful reflection about inquiry  • Includes insightful implications for the inquiry based on findings with clear connections to research literature  • Uses specific, appropriate evidence to support claims  **9-10 points** | • Includes general reflection about findings  • Includes general implications for the inquiry based on findings; attempts connections to research literature  • Uses some appropriate evidence to support claims  **7-8 points** | • Includes little/no reflection about findings  • Missing implications for the inquiry based on findings; no connections to research literature  • Uses little/no evidence to support claims  **0-6 points** |

Attachment B

**LEE 224 CASE STUDY RUBRIC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Rubric  X 5 | Results | Analysis | Strengths/ Weaknesses | Instructional Recommendations | Writing Mechanics |
| Exemplary      4 | All assessment results reported clearly, concisely, and accurately. | All assessments analyzed accurately, thoroughly and competently | All needs and strengths targeted. Summary is supported by multiple and varied assessments | 2-3 recommendations provided; all accurately address needs and build on strengths; all appropriately supported; at least 1 activity for home | Essentially error-free; Meets guidelines for APA publication |
| Accomplished 3 | Most quantitative and qualitative assessment results reported clearly, concisely, and accurately. | Most assessments analyzed accurately; some analyses lack depth | Most needs and strengths targeted. Summary is supported by multiple and varied assessments | 2-3 recommendations provided; most accurately address needs and build on strengths; most appropriately supported; at least 1 activity for home | Minor errors; normal conventions of spelling and grammar; errors do not interfere with comprehensibility; Minor APA errors; APA style/ format used throughout paper |
| Developing     2 | Some quantitative and qualitative assessment results reported clearly, concisely, and accurately. | Some assessments analyzed accurately; most analyses lack depth | Some needs and strengths targeted; summary is supported by single assessments | Incomplete recommendations; some accurately address needs and build on strengths; some appropriately supported | Frequent spelling/ grammar errors that interfere with comprehensibility; not all APA format followed |
| Beginning       1 | Few quantitative and qualitative assessment results reported clearly, concisely, and accurately. | Few assessments analyzed accurately; few analyses are through | Few needs and strengths targeted; summary does not refer to assessments | Incomplete recommendations; few accurately address needs and build on strengths; few appropriately supported | Numerous spelling/ grammar errors that interfere with comprehensibility; APA format not followed. |

Attachment C

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading/Language Arts Program  **COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION RUBRIC**  **(Rev.: 2018)** | | | | | |
| **Category** | **4**  Exemplary | **3**  **Accomplished** | **2**  **Adequate** | **1**  **Developing** | **Score** |
| **Accuracy of**  **Information** | • all information reported accurately • information directly relates to topic | • most information reported correctly  • information included applies to topic | •  some information reported correctly  • may include information that does not apply to topic | • information reported inaccurately and/or obvious gap in information reported |  |
| **Breadth of**  **Knowledge** | • uses at least 4-5 relevant sources  • sources are used to make a coherent, informed argument about the topic  • places the sources in meaningful conversation with each other | • uses at least 3 relevant sources  • sources are used to make an informed argument about the topic  • places the sources in conversation with each other | • uses at least 2 relevant sources  • may include sources not relevant to topic  • begins to make an informed argument about the topic | • uses at least 1 relevant source  • includes sources not relevant to topic  • little, if any, discernable argument made about the topic |  |
| **Application of**  **Knowledge** | • clearly links theory, research, and examples to frame issues of practice  • includes multiple, meaningful examples to illustrate application of research to practice  • examples are innovative in their approach | • draws on a combination of theory, research, and examples to frame issues of practice  • includes multiple examples to illustrate application of research to practice | • draws on research or examples to frame issues of practice  • includes at least one example to illustrate application of research to practice | • attempts to draw on research or examples to frame issues of practice; research or example may not be relevant  • includes no relevant applications of research to practice |  |
| **Organization** | • response is a  cohesive flow of ideas with transitions and a solid opening and closing  • apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs  • appropriate, clear and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs | • cohesive flowing narrative in terms of related ideas, meaningful transitions and an argument from beginning to end.  • distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs | • written response alludes to related ideas and argument from beginning to end  • uneven paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped  • some awkward or missing transitions | • incoherent in terms of connecting ideas, making meaningful transitions and crafting a solid argument from beginning to end  • repetitive, wanders, arbitrary or no paragraphs structure, illogical or no transitions |  |
| **Conventions** | • apt and precise diction  • syntactic variety  • clear command of Standard English | • some mechanical difficulties  • occasional problematic word choice or awkward syntax errors  • occasional grammar errors  • some wordiness | • occasional major grammar errors (e.g. agreement, tense)  • frequent minor grammar errors (e.g. prepositions, articles)  • occasional imprecise dictions  • awkward syntax  • wordiness | • frequent major and minor grammar problems  • frequent imprecise diction  • wordiness  • awkward syntax  • repetitive sentence patterns  • problems impede meaning |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE**  **Comment for exams** that **score below 1.0-1.99** | | | | |  |