

**CHICO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**ASSESSMENT SUMMARY UPDATE**

PROGRAM: MA in Education

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
Fa16-Sp17	<b>SLO #3a Demonstrate Scholarly Writing</b>	<p><b>Writing Proficiency 1</b> (Scale 0-28) Upon application to the MA in Education program, candidates submit an Initial Writing Sample (WP1), which is scored by the MA in Education Writing Rubric.</p> <p><b>Writing Proficiency 2</b> (Score 0-28) To advance to candidacy, candidates must submit two papers that are evaluated on the MA in Education writing rubric. The two scores for an individual are averaged for the WP2 score.</p> <p><b>Exit Survey:</b> (Scale 1-5 ) Item 13 measures perception of how well the program prepared candidates to engage in scholarly writing on a 5 point likert</p>	<p><b>Writing Proficiency</b> (N=36 program finishers) WP1-Admission Mean= 20.4/28</p> <p>WP2--Advancement to candidacy Mean=26/28</p> <p>Growth=3.4 points or 12%</p> <p><b>Exit Survey</b> (n=10):  5 Very well=60.00%  4 Well=40.00%  3 Adequately=0  2 Poorly=0  1 Not at all=0</p>	<p><b>Writing Proficiency</b> Revised the writing rubric by adding another column to more adequately delineate progress along the rubric. We adjusted cut scores for admission and advancement to candidacy and added a score of 26/28 on the thesis/project recommended for distinction. Course instructors were encouraged to use the MA writing rubric for their major assignments.</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		scale, from “very well” to “not at all”.		
Fa15-Sp16	<b>SLO #3a Demonstrate Scholarly Writing</b>	<p><b>Writing Proficiency 1</b> (Scale 0-28) Upon application to the MA in Education program, candidates submit an Initial Writing Sample (WP1), which is scored by the MA in Education Writing Rubric.</p> <p><b>Writing Proficiency 2</b> (Score 0-28) To advance to candidacy, candidates must submit two papers that are evaluated on the MA in Education writing rubric. The two scores for an individual are averaged for the WP2 score.</p> <p><b>Exit Survey:</b> (Scale 1-5 ) Item 13 measures perception of how well the program prepared candidates to engage in scholarly writing on a 5 point likert scale, from “very well” to “not at all”.</p>	<p><b>Writing Proficiency</b> (N=19 program finishers) WP1-Admission Mean= 21.9/28</p> <p>WP2--Advancement to candidacy Mean=25.3/28</p> <p>Growth=3.4 points or 12%</p> <p><b>Exit Survey</b> (n=17): 5 Very well=63.64% 4 Well=36.36% 3 Adequately=0 2 Poorly=0 1 Not at all=0</p>	Began revising syllabi and key assessments to ensure that academic writing is taught and assessed systematically throughout the program

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
Fa14-Sp15	<b>SLO #2</b> Candidates demonstrate competence in analyzing and evaluating alternative points of view and drawing judicious conclusions as evidenced through scholarly writing.	<b>Writing Rubric:</b> First, upon application to the MA in Education program, candidates submit an Initial Writing Sample (WPI), which is scored by the MA in Education Writing Rubric. Scores determine whether they will need to take an additional writing course before advancing to classified status. Second, to advance to candidacy, candidates must submit two papers (WP2) that achieve a designated cut score on the MA in Education writing rubric. Faculty participate in scoring and annual calibration activities.  <b>Exit Survey:</b> Items measure perception of writing ability and support from faculty.	<b>Writing Rubric:</b> WPI--Admission (n=27) 0% reached level 4 on rubric WP2--Advancement to candidacy (n=45) 33.5% reached level 4 on rubric, 64% reached level 3 (must reach level 3 or 4 to advance to candidacy).  <b>Exit Survey (n=17):</b> 88.2% candidates agreed or strongly agreed that writing has improved, 94.1% candidates agreed or strongly agreed that faculty supported their growth in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At program meetings, engaged in discussions about how to address common writing issues.</li> <li>Syllabi all designate APA as the writing format in all MA in Education and credential courses .</li> <li>All students and faculty have access to writing supports on the MA in Education online community in BbLearn</li> </ul>
	<b>SLO #4</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using technology for	Exit Survey	<b>Exit Survey (n=17)</b> 76.5 % of our graduate students reported they often or very often used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty modeled the suite of Google Apps available for all CSUC students through the mail.csuchico.edu accounts.</li> </ul>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
	professional development.		technology tools in their planning and preparation for teaching, a drop of 12% since 2013-2014. The three leading technology tools used are Google Tools, web resources, web searching.	
	<b>SLO #5</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using a variety of technologies for successful implementation in teaching and learning with students.	Exit Survey	<b>Exit Survey</b> (n=16) 56.3% of our graduate students indicated that they make digital technologies available to their students often or very often, up 13.3% from 2013-14.  88.2% candidates reported feeling confident in using technology in teaching and learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty began using the Swivl Camera for delivering online instruction and archiving course modules.</li> </ul> <p>Faculty modeled the appropriate use of emerging technologies (such as embedded movies, mobile devices, Twitter, Google Hangouts, Collaborate, Swivl Cameras, etc.) in their course delivery and instruction to strengthen the course and model best practices for implementation.</p>
Fa13-Sp14	<b>SLO #2</b> Candidates demonstrate competence in analyzing and evaluating alternative points of view and drawing judicious conclusions as evidenced through scholarly writing.	<b>Writing Rubric:</b> First, upon application to the MA in Education program, candidates submit an Initial Writing Sample (WPI), which is scored by the MA in Education Writing Rubric. Scores determine whether they will need to take an additional writing course before advancing to classified	<b>Writing Rubric:</b> WPI-----Admission (n=148) 17% reach level 4 on rubric WPII-----Advancement to candidacy (n=90) 60% reach level 4 on rubric  <b>Exit Survey</b> (n=19): 94% candidates agree or strongly agree that writing has improved, and faculty support their growth in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Syllabi all designate APA as the writing format in all MA in Education and credential courses</li> <li>All faculty received copies of the <i>Publication Manual for the American Psychological Association, Sixth Ed.</i></li> <li>Faculty participated in workshop on APA writing style</li> </ul> <p>All students and faculty have access to writing supports on the MA in Education online community in BbLearn</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		<p>status. Second, to advance to candidacy, candidates must submit two papers (WP11) that achieve a designated cut score on the MA in Education writing rubric. Faculty participate in scoring and annual calibration activities.</p> <p><b>Exit Survey:</b> Items measure perception of writing ability and support from faculty.</p>		
	<p><b>SLO #4</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using technology for professional development.</p>	Exit Survey	<p><b>Exit Survey</b> (n=19) 89.5 % of our graduate students reported they often or very often used technology tools in their planning and preparation for teaching, a gain of 8% since 2012---2013. The three leading technology tools used are Google Tools, web resources, web searching.</p>	Faculty modeled the suite of Google Apps available for all CSUC students through the mail.csuchico.edu accounts.
	<p><b>SLO #5</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using a variety of technologies</p>	Exit Survey	<p><b>Exit Survey</b> (n=19) 43.8% of our graduate students indicated that they make digital technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty were trained on the use of the Swivl Camera for delivering online instruction and archiving course modules.</li> </ul>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
	for successful implementation in teaching and learning with students.		<p>available to their students often or very often, down 20% from 2012---2013. (May be explained by the fact that many students own their own technologies).</p> <p>100% candidates report feeling confident or that they are gaining confidence in using technology in teaching and learning.</p>	Faculty modeled the appropriate use of emerging technologies (such as embedded movies, mobile devices, Twitter, Google Hangouts, Collaborate, Swivl Cameras, etc.) in their course delivery and instruction to strengthen the course and model best practices for implementation.
Fa12-Sp13	<p><b>SLO #2</b></p> <p>Candidates demonstrate competence in analyzing and evaluating alternative points of view and drawing judicious conclusions as evidenced through scholarly writing.</p>	<p>Assessment of this SLO was done in 2012-2013 across all MA in Ed. options and pathways, using the following assessments and the MA in Ed. Writing Rubric:</p> <p>Initial Writing Sample (WPI)</p> <p>Advancement to Candidacy Writing Samples (WP II)</p> <p>Actions taken included the implementation of the analytic SOE MA in Ed. Writing Rubric and faculty discussion and calibration ensure inter-</p>	<p>This was a transition year for implementing our new assessment tool, the analytic SOE MA in Ed. Writing Rubric from our older holistic rubric.</p> <p>The 2012-2013 data clearly indicate that the implementation of the improved MA in Education Writing Rubric and the intervention course, EDCI 640: MA in Education Research Writing, are having a positive impact on writing proficiency results for WP II.</p> <p>There is a heightened awareness of the importance of strong writing skills by our graduate students. This is supported by consistently</p>	<p>Program applicants receiving scores below 17 on the initial writing assessment (WPI) will be denied admittance to the MA in Ed program. Applicants scoring 17-20 pts. will be Conditionally Classified (Pending GPA review) and referred to EDCI 640 <i>Research Writing Development</i> in order to improve their academic writing skills. This non-credit course is offered fall and spring through Continuing Ed. Numbers are high in the fall due to the many RTR students who are required to take it. Some students elect to take EDCI 640. When numbers reach more than ten, the course is co-taught to provide needed support for students.</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		rater reliability in the scoring.	stronger submissions of written work.	
	<b>SLO #4</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using technology for professional development.	This was assessed with our MA in Education Finisher survey conducted at the end of fall, spring and summer semesters. Actions taken included professional development opportunities for faculty with the following technology tools: Zotero, Bb Learn, Turnitin using the Originality Report, Turnitin using GradeMark	81.4 % of our graduate students reported they used technology tools in their planning and preparation for teaching. <b>This is an increase of 4.9 % from last year.</b> The three leading technology tools used are web resources, presentation tools, and web searching. Spreadsheets, databases, and collaboration & communications tools are also used to a great degree.	Move to Bb by campus has demanded that faculty get trained and use the newer tools, including Collaborate. Faculty can now enhance courses with use of blogs, journals, Turnitin submissions and other mashups for grad students to experience. Further, they can continue to support and provide information on emerging technologies in their content areas.
	<b>SLO #5</b> Candidates demonstrate proficiency in using a variety of technologies for successful implementation in teaching and learning with students.	This was assessed with our MA in Ed Finisher survey conducted at the end of fall, spring, and summer semesters. Actions taken included: hands-on training sessions for faculty with Turnitin and Grademark; Discussions reinforcing technology available for use in our classrooms; Student demonstrations featuring emergning technologies in courses;	68.2 % of our graduate students indicated that they make digital technologies available to their students often or very often. <b>This is an increase of 18.2 % from last year.</b> Use of web resources, web searching skills, interactive whiteboard skills and presentation skills topped their choices. 0% of our students are reluctant or gaining confidence in using technology in their teaching and learning. <b>In addressing</b>	An effort to educate our graduate student population on current, free technologies available to them and their students will be made though announcements and class demonstrations. In particular, we will feature the suite of Google Apps available for all CSUC students through the mail.csuchico.edu accounts.

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
		incorporation of tablet and mobile devices in instruction as appropriate.	both SLO #4 and SLO #5, all of our graduate students feel confident in using technology tools. This is a 33% increase from last year.	