

## Assessment Report Evaluation Cover Sheet

Program: MA LLSS – Bilingual Education / Bilingual Endorsement

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: 10/21/09

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Report Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

Consider more “direct” assessment measures and clarify connection between curriculum mapping and proposed assessment plan. When will the mapping be completed? Include specific results for assessment measures.

## Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2008-09

Department/Program: LLSS

Degree program(s): MA – Bilingual / Bilingual Endorsement

Person(s) preparing report: Holbrook Mahn

Date submitted: October 7, 2009

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

*See attached assessment grid.*

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

*See attached assessment grid.*

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

*Program continued with curriculum mapping and was able to align student learning outcomes in courses throughout program. This was expanded to include online courses, which were added by the program.*

4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

*The CARC develops systems to document assessment to ensure consistency in reporting across the COE. Assessment data are entered into the COEAS by program coordinators. This system generates reports by semester and type of assessment. Program coordinators share these data with their program faculty. Program faculty then discuss the results of the assessments and how they inform faculty about their students' learning. Faculty also examine what the results indicate about the effectiveness of the program overall. Finally the faculty consider whether the assessment method does accurately and effectively evaluate SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. Programs report and discuss results of their assessments at Department Meetings. Department Chairs then share the results of assessment at the College level. The CARC meets regularly to examine college-wide assessment procedures. The chair of CARC and the Associate Dean in charge of assessment meet with Departments and programs to help evaluate and develop ongoing assessment systems that are manageable, effective, and meaningful.*

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.

*Program meetings to discuss both direct and indirect assessments.*

**6. Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year (2008-09). If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning (see link in #2 above).)**

A goal for the program is to add rubrics and other assessments to measure SLOs for online courses.

**NCA Assessment Grid -- MA Bilingual / Bilingual Endorsement**

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare teachers who understand theoretical and practical aspects of effective curriculum, instruction, and assessment of bilingual students.	Understand history of bilingual education in the United States and understand local, state, and national issues that influence the education of the bilingual student	U, P, K, S	Course Grade LLSS 580 LLSS 503 PIP 2	I	0-4	3
	Demonstrate understanding of importance of providing content instruction in at least two languages and to use effective instructional strategies for bilingual students, including assessment.	U, P, I, K, S, R	Course Grade LLSS 482 PIP 2	I	0-4	3
	Appreciation of the contributions that Spanish and indigenous languages make to the culture of the Southwest and the world	U, P, K, S	Course Grade LLSS 583 PIP 2	I	0-4	3
Prepare teachers who reflect on their practice and who, through professional leadership, advocates for bilingual education in school and community.	Develop ability to synthesize research on bilingualism and ability to apply it in their classrooms and use it to participate in broader policy discussions related to bilingual education. (N/A for Endorsement)	U, P, I, K, S, R	Comprehensive Examination PIP4	D	1-3	2.5

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning  
MA LLSS – Bilingual and Bilingual Endorsment**

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score for each Element</b>
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	3
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	1
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	2
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2009-10), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	2

## Assessment Report Evaluation Cover Sheet

Program: MA LLSS – Educational Thought and Sociocultural Studies

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: 10/21/09

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Report Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

## Annual Program Report Narrative

### COE Program Assessment Report Narrative

Academic year: 2009-1010

Department/Program: LLSS / ETSS

Degree program(s): MA-Educational Thought and Sociocultural Studies

Person(s) preparing report: Tryphenia B. Peele-Eady (CARC representative, ETSS)

Date submitted: September 28, 2009

1. List the broad learning goal(s) and corresponding student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed by your program during the previous academic year.

*We assessed one broad learning goal:*

*Students will engage in the study of broad educational concepts and theoretical debates in the social foundations of education and be able to understand social justice as it relates to education specifically.*

*We identified two SLOs:*

*(1) Students will demonstrate a philosophical, theoretical, and historical knowledge of the relationship between social justice and education; and (2) Students will demonstrate practical applications of a social justice approach to education.*

*See attached assessment plan matrix.*

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

*See attached assessment plan matrix.*

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

*The ETSS faculty determined that the current assessment system in place in the Department of Language, Literacy, & Sociocultural Studies (LLSS) works well for our program. Overall student performance on the various assessment and PIP measures we implemented was high. Specifically, a review of departmental data reveals that of the sixty Masters students admitted to the Department of LLSS in the 2008-2009 academic year, .03% were ETSS students. Three (.05%) ETSS students took and passed comprehensive exams and graduated from the program in the 2008-09 academic year. The cumulative GPAs for these students ranged from 3.78 to 3.94. These data indicate*

that ETSS students are meeting anticipated learning outcomes by maintaining grades of B or better in courses and graduating with GPAs that are well above the 3.0 mark. Data also show that fairly equal numbers of students who enter the ETSS program also graduate.

Table 1

**LLSS MA Students for Fall/Sum 08 and Spring/09**

Semester	LLSS/ Admitted	ETSS/ Admitted	LLSS/ Graduated	ETSS/ Graduated	LLSS/ Comps	ETSS/ Comps
Fall/08	17+2 Readmits	0	12	0	13 (1 distinction)	1 GPA (3.78)
Sum/08	6*	0		1	0	0
Spring/09	33+2 Readmits	2	28	2	32 (7 distinction)	2 GPAs (3.94 & 3.79)

\*Fall/Sum 08 are admitted together

- Describe the actions and/or revisions that you have implemented or plan to implement in response to the assessment processes and results.

*Actions were implemented according to the assessment plan we submitted last year (see assessment plan matrix). Assessment is on going. The ETSS faculty regularly meets to discuss students' overall progress, and we relay this information to the LLSS faculty when it is appropriate. As we continue to explore ways to strengthen our assessment of student work, particularly in the area of social justice. and improve overall student learning, the ETSS faculty will continue to (1) meet to discuss and assess students' progress throughout the academic year and (2) require students to maintain a grade of B or better per course and overall grade point average (G.P.A).*

*An action we anticipated last year was to explore developing a rubric to assess elements of social justice in the comprehensive exam for the Master's and Ph.D. degrees in relation to the general program objectives. Although we began discussing this possibility, we have not convened to discuss faculty recommendations as of yet. We will convene to discuss these recommendations on October 1, 2009. Once compiled and refined, we plan to communicate these recommendations to the LLSS Department Chair and faculty before the end of the 2009-2010 academic year.*

*We continue to explore ways to improve our assessment procedures in ways that maximize student learning*

- IF you will be adding any additional learning goals and/or student learning objectives to be assessed in the coming year, please list below.

*We will continue to work on the same two SLOs we identified in the 2008-2009 academic year. We will not add additional SLOs to be assessed.*

**NCA Assessment Grid: MA LLSS - Educational Thought & Sociocultural Studies (ETSS)**

**Contact:** Tryphenia B. Peele-Eady, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, tbpeele@unm.edu

<b>Program Goal</b>	<b>Student Learning Objective</b>	<b>COE/ Univ. Goal</b>	<b>Assessment/PIP/ Course if applicable</b>	<b>Direct/ Indirect</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b>Pass Score</b>
Students will engage in the study of broad educational concepts and theoretical debates in the social foundations of education and be able to understand social justice as it relates to education specifically.	(1) Students will demonstrate a philosophical, theoretical, and historical knowledge of the relationship between social justice and education;	K, U	<p>M.A./Ph.D.: [PIP 2]                      LLSS 511, LLSS 515, LLSS 516, LLSS 518, LLSS 521, LLSS 523, LLSS 530, LLSS 587, LLSS 593</p> <p>M.A.: [PIP 4]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan I-Master’s Thesis (LLSS 599)</li> <li>• Plan II- Literature Review Option (LLSS 590)</li> <li>• Plan II- Comprehensive Exam (LLSS 598)</li> </ul> <p>Ph.D.:                      LLSS 640, LLSS 645, LLSS 615, LLSS 618, LLSS 696</p> <p>Ph.D.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive Exam [PIP 2 (after coursework)]</li> <li>• Advancement to Candidacy [PIP 2 (after comprehensive exam)]</li> <li>• Dissertation Proposal Hearing [PIP 2]</li> <li>• Dissertation Defense [PIP 4]</li> </ul> <p>*Grade of pass, B, or better in coursework.</p>	<p>I</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>I</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>I</p>	Grade point average 3.0-4.0	Successful completion of coursework (grade of Pass, B, or better).

	(2) Students will demonstrate practical applications of a social justice approach to education;	K I, U, P, S, R	<p>M.A/Ph.D.: [PIP 2] LLSS 511, LLSS 515, LLSS 516, LLSS 518, LLSS 521, LLSS 523, LLSS 530, LLSS 587, LLSS 593</p> <p>M.A.: [PIP 4]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan I-Master’s Thesis (LLSS 599)</li> <li>• Plan II- Literature Review Option (LLSS 590)</li> <li>• Plan II- Comprehensive Exam (LLSS 598)</li> </ul> <p>Ph.D.: LLSS 640, LLSS 645, LLSS 615, LLSS 618, LLSS 696</p> <p>Ph.D.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive Exam [PIP 2 (after coursework)]</li> <li>• Advancement to Candidacy [PIP 2 (after comprehensive exam)]</li> <li>• Dissertation Proposal Hearing [PIP 2]</li> <li>• Dissertation Defense [PIP 4]</li> </ul> <p>*Grade of pass, B, or better in coursework.</p>	I  D D D  I  D D D D I	Grade point average 3.0-4.0	Successful completion of coursework (grade of Pass, B, or better).
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning  
MA LLSS – Educational Thought and Sociocultural Studies**

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score for each Element</b>
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	3
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	2
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	3
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2009-10), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	3

## Assessment Report Evaluation Cover Sheet

Program: MA LLSS – Literacy / Language Arts

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: 10/21/09

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Report Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

## Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2008-09

Department/Program: **LLSS Literacy/Language Arts**

Degree program(s): **MA**

Person(s) preparing report: P. Pence

Date submitted: 10/7/09

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

*See attached Assessment Grid.*

Student Objective (Student Learning Outcome) 1: Students will synthesize foundational, theoretical, and applied knowledge of program content in writing.

a) Measure	b) Sample	c) Timetable	d) Setting
Comprehensive examination— synthesis paper.	All literacy MA students who have completed coursework. N=18	Each semester students had eight weeks to complete and submit their final version to their committee of three faculty.	Each student participated in LLSS 590 in the semester in which they wrote their exams.

Student Objective (Student Learning Outcome) 1: Students will demonstrate understanding of the acquisition, teaching, and learning of literacy.

a) Measure	b) Sample	c) Timetable	d) Setting
Course grades in LLSS 532	All literacy MA students who took the course. The course is a program requirement.	Summative semester evaluation by the instructor of the course.	Course assignments.

### 3. Results of the assessment

The results of the assessment were encouraging.

Eighteen students took and passed their comprehensive examinations, and one passed with distinction. Nineteen students were admitted to the literacy program in 2009-10, so we admitted almost as many students as we graduated from the MA program.

Twenty-four students registered for LLSS 532 in 2008-9 (7 on campus for F 2008, and 17 for Sp 2009 in Rio Rancho). Seventeen students successfully completed LLSS 532 with a score of 3 (grade of B) or above, and one student audited the course. The average score was 3.41, and the median score was 4.0. These scores seem entirely appropriate for a graduate course, with the average grade being around a B+ or A-. Scores reflect a 75% pass rate. Six students dropped the course, which is what graduate students usually do, rather than fail a course. Out of the six students who dropped the course, two students were don-degree seeking.

### 4. Actions or revisions

We reviewed the rubric used for evaluation of comprehensive examinations, and found that it accurately summarized the characteristics of a paper that demonstrates students' abilities to "synthesize foundational, theoretical, and applied knowledge of program content." We felt no further action was necessary at this time.

The majority of comprehensive examinations (12) were taken by students from an off campus literacy cohort in Los Lunas. We also have another off campus cohort in Rio Rancho. Given the current rate of successful program completion, we plan to continue to recruit and serve teachers in regions surrounding Albuquerque.

LLSS 532 presents current research and theory on the reading process and involved students in activities that allowed them to demonstrate their understanding of this body of information and thinking. The instructor's criteria for grading are clear and available for students on the syllabus. The grades for the course indicate sufficient rigor while providing adequate support for success. Upon further investigation, we found that students dropped the course because of personal reasons that prevented them from having the time to devote to the course, rather than anticipating failure in the course.

### 5. & 6 Additional learning goals or student objectives

We will continue with our current learning goals because they are fundamental to becoming knowledgeable literacy practitioners. We will continue to track of scores on LLSS 532 and completion of MA comprehensive examinations because they are excellent indicators of student learning. By tracking these scores over time and comparing them to admissions data, we can monitor program rigor, student success rate in the program, and average time for program completion. Longitudinal data of this sort will help us to better ensure continuing program quality and sufficient support for our students.

**NCA Assessment Grid: LLSS MA, Literacy/Language Arts Concentration**

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare educators who understand educational research, theory, and practice and can apply their knowledge in professional settings.	Students will synthesize foundational, theoretical, and applied knowledge of program content in writing.	U,P,I K,S,R	MA Comprehensive Exam, PIP 4	D	0-2	1
	Demonstrate understanding of the acquisition, teaching, and learning of literacy	U,P K,S	LLSS 532: The Reading Process	D	0 – 4.00	3.0

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning  
MA LLSS – Literacy / Language Arts**

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score for each Element</b>
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	2
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	3
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	3
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2009-10), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	3

## Assessment Report Evaluation Cover Sheet

Program: MA LLSS – TESOL / Endorsement

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: 10/21/09

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Report Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

Consider more “direct” assessment measures and clarify connection between curriculum mapping and proposed assessment plan. When will the mapping be completed? Include specific results for assessment measures.

## Annual Program Report Narrative

Academic year: 2008-09

Department/Program: **LLSS – TESOL / Endorsement**

Degree program(s): **MA -- TESOL**

Person(s) preparing report: Holbrook Mahn

Date submitted: October 7, 2009

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

*See attached assessment grid.*

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered.

*See attached assessment grid.*

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

*Program continued with curriculum mapping and was able to align student learning outcomes in courses throughout program. This was expanded to include online courses which were added by the program.*

4. Describe the departmental process by which faculty reviewed the assessment procedures and results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

*The CARC develops systems to document assessment to ensure consistency in reporting across the COE. Assessment data are entered into the COEAS by program coordinators. This system generates reports by semester and type of assessment. Program coordinators share these data with their program faculty. Program faculty then discuss the results of the assessments and how they inform faculty about their students' learning. Faculty also examine what the results indicate about the effectiveness of the program overall. Finally the faculty consider whether the assessment method does accurately and effectively evaluate SLOs and program goals. Changes in program procedures, instruction, and assessment may result from a discussion of results. Programs report and discuss results of their assessments at Department Meetings. Department Chairs then share the results of assessment at the College level. The CARC meets regularly to examine college-wide assessment procedures. The chair of CARC and the Associate Dean in charge of assessment meet with Departments and programs to help evaluate and develop ongoing assessment systems that are manageable, effective, and meaningful.*

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were implemented in response to the assessment processes and results.

*Program meetings to discuss both direct and indirect assessments.*

6. **Given the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the next year (2008-09). If significant changes have been made to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy, please clearly describe. (Remember that half of all assessment measures must be direct measures of student learning (see link in #2 above).)**

*A goal for the program is to add rubrics and other assessments to measure SLOs for online courses.*

**NCA Assessment Grid – MA TESOL / Endorsement**

Program Goal	Student Learning Objective	COE/ Univ. Goal	Assessment/PIP/ Course if applicable	Direct/ Indirect	Score Range	Pass Score
Prepare teachers who understand theoretical and practical aspects of effective curriculum, instruction, and assessment of English Language Learners (ELL).	Understand first and second language development.	U, P, K, S	Course Grade LLSS 556 PIP2	I	0-4	3
	Demonstrate ability to use effective instructional strategies for ELLs, including assessment.	U, P, I K, S, R	Course Grade LLSS 482 PIP2	I	0-4	3
	Modification of lesson plans to meet the language and literacy needs of ELLs	U, P, K, S	Modified Lesson Plan LLSS 559 Grading Criteria Checklist PIP2	D	0-10	7
Prepare teachers who reflect on their practice and who, through professional leadership, advocates for ELLs in school and community.	Develop ability to synthesize research and apply it their classrooms and use it to participate in broader policy discussions related to ELLs. (N/A for Endorsement)	U, P, I, K, S, R	Comprehensive Examination  PIP4	D	1-3	2.5

**Evaluative Rubric for Annual Progress Reports on Assessment of Student Learning  
MA LLSS – TESOL / Endorsement**

<b>Report Elements</b>	<b>Exemplary 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Unacceptable 1</b>	<b>Score for each Element</b>
<i>Degree program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the year</i>	SLOs were stated in terms of measurable knowledge, behavior, value, or disposition.	Not all of the SLOs were stated in measurable terms.	No SLOs were listed.	3
<i>Assessment method/measure for each SLO</i>	Two or more appropriate measures were used for each SLO.	At least one measure was used or developed for each SLO.	Measures were not used or developed or were inadequate or were not discussed.	3
<i>Direct measures (at least 1/2 of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure is to be applied to each SLO.)</i>	At least 1/2 of assessment measures were direct, and there was at least one direct measure for each SLO.	No direct measures were used during the reporting year, but direct measures are part of the plan for next year.	No direct measures were implemented or planned for the next year.	3
<i>Participants (students or alumni involved for each measure)</i>	Participants were identified for each SLO, and valid sample selection described.	Participants were identified for some SLOs, but there was some lack of clarity.	Participants were not identified.	3
<i>Timeframe in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The timeframe for administration of measures or collection of data was specified.	The timeframe was specified for some SLOs, but not for others or there was some lack of clarity.	The timeframe was not specified.	3

<i>Setting/forum in which measures were administered or data collected</i>	The setting or forum in which each of the measures were administered or data collected was specified.	The setting or forum was specified for some measures, but not for all, or there was lack of clarity.	The setting or forum was not specified.	3
<i>Results</i>	Results were described for each SLO that was assessed.	Results were described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	Results were not described for the SLOs that were to be assessed.	1
<i>Process for data presentation to and discussion by faculty</i>	The process that was used for the interpretation, review, and discussion of the data by the faculty was described.	The process was described for a sub-set of the SLOs and/or there was some lack of clarity.	The process was not described. It is not clear whether the faculty considered the results of the assessment.	3
<i>Actions or revisions implemented based on assessment results</i>	Specific actions or revisions have been or will be implemented based on assessment results.	Specific actions or revisions were described but the report of or plan for implementation was unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There were no specific actions or revisions described.	2
<i>Description of plans for the coming year (2009-10), including any significant changes to degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy</i>	<i>Plans for the coming year and any significant changes in SLOs or the overall assessment strategy are clearly described.</i>	<i>Plans and any significant changes were described but in some aspects the description was unclear or incomplete.</i>	<i>There was no description of plans for the coming year nor were any significant changes in SLOs or assessment strategy described.</i>	2