

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO
ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Save your Report with the following file name: APAR-22-23-Dept OR Program Name, for example APAR-22-23-CMST

Date: _____
Due: 9/30/20XX

I. Assessment of Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

1. Program Name:

Master's of Arts in Education

2. Program Level Student Learning Outcomes:

List the learning outcomes or provide URL (*ensure URL is current*).

Of note, this [pubic-facing webpage](#) is outdated.

1. The Role of Education in a Democracy

Graduates will be able to draw from theory to identify and analyze fundamental principles of democratic schooling and the central role that teachers and schools play in advancing socially and ecologically just outcomes for students, families, and communities.

- A. Describe the foundational role of education in a pluralistic democracy.
- B. Analyze and evaluate how a community's strengths and resources can be used to support student learning.
- C. Design an implementation plan that promotes one or more areas of the [School of Education conceptual framework](#) that contribute toward equitable educational experiences and/or outcomes.

2. Curriculum and Instruction

Graduates will be able to design and enact curricula that promote social and ecological justice (i.e., service-learning, community-based projects, etc.). Identify and/or design practices that promote educational practices that align with one or more areas of the [School of Education conceptual framework](#) and promote equitable/humanizing educational experiences and/or outcomes

- A. Make sustainable instructional decisions based on a thorough understanding of learning contexts, including demographic, cultural, ecological, and economic factors.
- B. Critique professional practice using methods of research.
- C. Demonstrate proficiency in using a variety of technologies for student success.

3. Assessment and Evaluation of Learning

Graduates will be able to articulate the purpose of assessment in educational settings as well as the importance of varied, equitable, and valid assessment practices.

- A. Critique the role of a variety of assessments at student, classroom, institutional, and higher levels.
- B. Analyze qualitative and quantitative data to determine student learning outcomes in order to critically reflect on educational practices.
- C. Examine biases and assumptions when creating and/or analyzing assessments to meet the needs of underserved student populations.

4. Scholarly Inquiry

Graduates will be informed consumers and producers of educational research that support the preservation of the public commons and the public good.

- A. Critique, analyze, examine research approaches to inquiry in education.
- B. Engage with humanizing and ethical research practices that draw upon and honor knowledge of indigenous, regional, and local communities.
- C. Demonstrate scholarship in one or more areas of the conceptual framework (i.e., inclusivity, democracy, sustainability, service, inquiry, and praxis-based pedagogy).
- D. Pose research and/or critical thinking questions; collect and analyze data pertinent to those questions; and communicate results effectively- both orally and in writing- to vested communities.

5. Professional Collaboration

Graduates will be able to develop meaningful relationships with underserved communities to communicate issues and ideas, solve problems, and promote civic engagement while intentionally cultivating socially and ecologically just systems.

- A. Advocate for school and community collaborations to solve problems that lead to a more socially just and sustainable democracy.
- B. Lead efforts to collaborate with school and community partners in the educational process (e.g., needs assessment, listening, co-planning).
- C. Promote a humanizing culture for collaboration that utilizes conflict resolution, embraces inclusive practices, and honors the identities and backgrounds of all invested.

3. Course Alignment Matrix:

Insert matrix here for reference or provide URL (*ensure URL is current*). This matrix must indicate in which courses the learning outcomes will be assessed (link to sample).

[The MA in Education Assessment Matrix](#) (link) shows alignment of SLOs with program coursework across the MA in Education Program

4. Closing the Loop: Departmental or College Discussions/Feedback:

How was last year's assessment results shared with the departmental faculty? Please summarize and/or provide the results of this sharing or discussion? Was the program provided with any college dean-level feedback? If so, please summarize and provide any departmental feedback to the college feedback provided.

At the first MA in Education faculty meeting of the year (Sept 6, 2022), a summary of results were shared via PowerPoint with faculty. The faculty has the opportunity to discuss the results, but discussion was minimal. There was no specific feedback based on the results. This was in part due to few respondents to the completer's survey and the those results were generally favorable.

The program was not provided any college-dean level feedback.

5. Closing the Loop: Programmatic Actions:

What has the program done to implement the planned program improvement actions from the last annual assessment report or from previous assessment reports? What is left to do and how/will it be accomplished?

Since our last report, 2018-2019, the SLOs were being revised to align with the School of Education's new conceptual framework. These revisions included benchmarks, alignment to course content/key assessments, and as necessary based on preliminary or formative data new learning/teaching support mechanisms.

6. What is your current Assessment Plan?

What SLOs have been assessed (since last 5 year review) and which SLOs are planned to be assessed in next 2-3 years. The plan may alter over time, but what is the plan at this time?

All SLOs are assessed over a two-year cycle with Scholarly Communication assessed every year.

SLOs
Last APAR
Current APAR

Former SLOs	1) Education in Democracy	2) Curriculum & Instruction	3) Assessment of Learning	4) Scholarly Communication	5) Professional Collaboration
AY 2017-18				X	
AY 2018-19		x	X	X	
AY 2019-20	x			x	x
Updated SLOs (2020)	1) Education in Democracy	2) Curriculum & Instruction	3) Assessment & Evaluation of Learning	4) Scholarly Inquiry	5) Professional Collaboration

AY 2020-21		X	X	X	
AY 2021- 2022	X			X	X
AY 2022-23		X	X	X	
AY 2023- 2024	X			X	X
AY 2024-25		X	X	X	

7. Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:

Which learning outcome(s) was or were assessed this year?

For 2021-2022, the following outcomes were assessed.

1. Role of Education in a Democracy
4. Scholarly Communication
5. Professional Collaboration

6. Artifact Components (assignments, rubric, and benchmark):

Describe the components of your artifact:

- a. What artifact(s) did you assess and for what course(s)?
 - a. For #1, we used Democratic Action Plan from EDMA 600
 - b. For #4, we used the writing samples for advancement to candidate status
 - c. For #5, we used the Disability Memoir/YA book clubs from SPED 661
- b. Why was/were this/these artifact(s) chosen and how many?
 - a. For #1, there were 12 students/submissions.
 - b. For #4, there 7 students with 2 samples each.
 - c. For #5, there were 11 students/5 group submissions
- c. Who evaluated the artifact(s) and how?
 - a. For #1 and #5, the respective course instructors evaluated the projects.
 - b. For #4, the advisor or Graduate Program Coordinator scores writing samples.
- d. Was a rubric used?
 - a. For #1 and #5, the respective course instructors had evaluation checklists
 - b. For #4, there is our [MA in Education writing rubric](#) (link).
- e. What benchmark was chosen to demonstrate proficiency?
 - a. For #1, benchmarks B and C were chosen.
 - b. For #4, benchmark A was chosen.
 - c. For #5, benchmark C was chosen.

7. Assessment Results:

Please describe/report outcomes of assessment. How well did students perform on the task? What percentage of students met the benchmark? Were there significant differences in the ratings of the evaluators? If so, what

might account for these difference? If students met the benchmark, what do they appear to be doing well and why? If students did not meet the benchmark, what are some possible reasons? You may use the table below to report results, adapting the table as necessary, but you should also provide a narrative describing and analyzing the assessment results.

Student Learning Outcome	Sample and Sample Size	Percent of Students Meeting Benchmark
1	12	100%
4	7 (Spring 2022) 3 (Fall 2021)	100% (by second attempt, 90% on first attempt)
5	11	100%

Based on the samples and data provided by faculty and from the writing samples required to advance to candidate status, students performed very well on the tasks. All students met the benchmarks based on the assessments. Specifically, students were able to analyze and evaluate how their community's strengths and resources can be used to support student learning and design an implementation. Similarly, students were able to practice and promote a humanizing culture for collaboration that utilizes conflict resolution, embraces inclusive practices, and honors the identities and backgrounds of all invested. Student were also able to critique, analyze, examine research approaches to inquiry in education. There does not appear to be a benchmark that is not being met via course work.

8. Planned Program Improvement Actions

Identify multiple, specific ways that the program can be improved on the basis of the assessment results. This could include curricular changes, changes to the learning outcomes themselves, new or modified assignments, course or program level standards established or modified, revised pedagogy, additional staffing or equipment needs, etc. How might these changes or improvements increase the percentage of students meeting the benchmark as well as the overall quality of the academic program?

To improve on these assessment results, the faculty can:

- 1) Better align key assessment to benchmarks of the respective objectives.
- 2) Improve school and community collaborations via coursework/assignments.

9. Name, Title, and E-Mail Address of Person Completing this Form:

Ben Seipel, MA in Education, Program Coordinator

10. Acknowledgement and Signatures:

a) Department Chair: _____

Comments (if desired):

b) College Coordinator or Associate Dean (if applicable):

Comments (if desired):

c) Dean or Associate Dean: _____

Comments (if desired):

II. Appendices (please include any of the following that are applicable to your program):

A. Rubric

Please see:

- [MA in Education writing rubric](#)
- Disability Book Club Rubric (attachment)
- EDMA 600 DAP Rubric (attachment)

B. Artifact Evaluated

See attachments

- SPED 661 Book Club
- SPED 661 Book Club Presentation
- Gattis DAP
- Democratic Action Project

Please submit completed reports electronically to your dean, associate dean, and/or college assessment coordinator by 9/30/XX.
Save Report with the following file name: APAR-22-23-DeptORProgramName, for example APAR-2223-CMST