



College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Biennial Assessment Report – Fall 2014
Early Childhood Education

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from Summer 2012 through Spring 2014.

Background

- 1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?**

The Master's in Early Childhood Education (ECE) program at CSULB is designed to provide a diverse student body with updated knowledge and skills (including leadership skills) necessary to fulfill various roles in the field of ECE. The program recruits candidates with classroom teaching experiences and helps them connect their classroom practices with theories, research, policies, and current discourse and debates. The mission of the program is to recruit and educate a diverse student population with the professional competencies necessary for teaching, leadership, management, and advocacy roles in the public sector and in community-based and non-profit organizations, such as public schools, federal and state funded preschool programs, community colleges, private and public early childhood programs. The curriculum emphasizes knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for ethical, developmentally and culturally appropriate teaching practices in diverse and inclusive classrooms with children from birth through age 8. The program also prepares candidates for management of early childhood organizations (including planning, implementing, and decision-making) that best represents the interests of all children and families. The pedagogical methods used for transaction of the program curriculum primarily focus on inquiry, critical and analytical thinking, and professional collaboration, with the goal of instilling a pursuit for life-long learning among candidates and nurturing a community of learners.

The knowledge-base, skills, and dispositions of Early Childhood Education (ECE).

The MA in ECE program is informed by various theoretical perspectives, research findings, current issues and debates, national policies, and national/ international organizations' positions, publications, and recommendations. The National Association for the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC) advanced program standards, in particular, are used to structure the program's curriculum and assessment measures. The program requires candidates to acquire an in-depth knowledge and understanding of young children's development and apply this understanding to design anti-bias, culturally appropriate, and inclusive curriculum and assessment measures for young children. Candidates read and reflect upon theories (historical and contemporary) and practices that highlight that learning and development are constructed within the context of social and cultural interactions. These theoretical perspectives allow candidates to situate children socially, culturally, as well as individually so as to evaluate the contextual appropriateness of theories and research studies;

reflect upon the school's hidden curriculum as well as policies and politics at the local, state, and national levels; and examine the beliefs and expectations of their own as well as that of the larger society that may impact teaching and learning in early childhood classrooms. Candidates read and reflect upon NAEYC's "Code of ethical conduct" for early childhood practitioners and examine current practices in the light of this code. Candidates design and implement strategies to reach out to parents, including culturally and linguistically diverse parents. They design plans for current and on-going leadership activities in the community, including administering an ECE program and advocacy activities for children and families. The program helps candidates gain inquiry skills and knowledge of research methods and understand their critical role as consumers of research-based knowledge and practices. It engages candidates to examine controversies and trends related to the field of early childhood education and justify their own stand on the issue. In addition, the program fosters among candidates an understanding of early childhood education across the world, helps them examine globalization and its impact (negative and positive) on the world's children, learn about the role of transnational organizations such as UNICEF to ensure children's rights, and realize the need for global child advocacy. To a certain extent, the program helps candidates to utilize technology as a tool to enhance learning and communication. The program's acknowledgement of the role of field experiences in contextualizing learning is evident in the requirement of 10 hours of field experiences for the majority of the program courses, with a total of 60 hours in the field. The ten hours of field experience required for a course is connected to an assignment that allows the instructor to assess candidates' ability to apply their learning from the course.

The ECE Master's program's mission, goals, and knowledge-base/skills/dispositions are aligned with the mission of the College of Education at CSULB. As most of our students are already teachers in diverse urban settings, the program courses focus on supporting professional educators and practitioners so that they could promote equity and excellence in their own classrooms. The course, EDEC 520 (Critical perspectives on early childhood curriculum and assessment) exposes students to effective pedagogy, and evidence-based practices, and new innovations in early childhood curriculum, assessment, and instruction. The course EDEC 523 (Administrations and supervision of early childhood programs) fosters students' attitude, knowledge, and skill in leadership and engages students in advocacy projects in the community. The course EDEC 621 (Research Seminar in Early Childhood Education), enables students to read and discuss literature reviews of scholarly discussions on issues, facing the field of early childhood education and the course, EDEC 622 (International Perspectives in Early Childhood Education), exposes students to issues of equity for young children and their families around the world and global child advocacy activities by national and international organizations.

The program has identified 7 key Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (see Table 1). These were adapted from the National Association for Education of young Children's advanced program standards. To integrate SLOs into courses, the mission statement of the program was reviewed along with course outlines and course objectives. Additionally, NAEYC's Advanced Program Standards were studied.

Table 1*Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards*

	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Outcome 6	Outcome 7
SLOs	Analyze theoretical perspectives that relate to young children and their families.	Demonstrate competency in building family and community relationships.	Apply principles of teaching and learning to early childhood classrooms.	Analyze current issues, debates, discussions, and research in the field of early childhood education.	Apply understanding of leadership roles that benefit children and families.	Analyze children's issues and early childhood education around the world.	Apply understanding of cultural diversity to personal philosophy and practices.
Signature Assignment(s)	A self-selected "ECE theorist" research paper and multimedia presentation	Parent workshop planning and implementation report	Case study of a child report	Review of research paper, multimedia presentation	Child advocacy plan, implementation	Country project research paper, multimedia presentation	Ethnographic research report with a culturally diverse parent
National Standards	Theory and Research	Building Family and Community Relationships; Collaboration and Mentoring	Child Development & Learning; Observing, Documenting, Assessing to Support Young Children and Families; Teaching and Learning	Research Methods	Communication Skills; Advocacy Skills; Leadership Skills	Cultural and global Competence	Cultural Competence; Growing as Professionals
Conceptual Framework	Scholarship	Evidence-based Practices; Collaboration; Leadership	Effective Pedagogy; Evidence-based practices; Innovation	Scholarship	Collaboration; Leadership; Advocacy	Advocacy	Advocacy
CSULB Learning Outcomes	Integrating liberal education	Collaborative problem solving	Well-prepared	Well-prepared	Collaborative problem solving	Engaged in global and local issues; Knowledge and respect for diversity	Engaged in global and local issues; Knowledge and respect for diversity
NCATE Elements	Content Knowledge	Professional Knowledge and Skills	Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Professional Knowledge and Skills	Professional Knowledge and Skills	Professional Dispositions, Professional Knowledge and Skills

Table 2*Program Specific Candidate Information, 2012-2014 – Transition Point 1 (Admission to Program)*

	2012-2013			2013-2014		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
Total:	34	28	23	38	24	20

Table 3*Program Specific Candidate Information, 2012-2014 – Transition Point 2 (Advancement to Culminating Experience)*

	2012-2013	2013-2014
Thesis (698)¹	4	1
Comps²	40	27

Table 4*Comprehensive Exam Results, 2012-2014*

	2012-2013	2013-2014
Passed	39	22
Failed	1	2
Total³	40	24

¹ This is data on all students who were enrolled in thesis work from Summer 2012 to Spring 2014. This figure may include students who actually “crossed into” this transition point prior to Fall 2012 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

² This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination from Summer 2012 to Spring 2014. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

³ The number of pass + fail does not equal the number of students who advanced to take the comps (Table 3) because some students who have registered for the exam do not attempt it. This data reflects number of attempts at one or more parts of the comprehensive exam from Summer 2012 to Spring 2014. Individuals who failed all or part of the exam and chose to retake it during AY 12-13 may be accounted for twice.

Table 5

Program Specific Candidate Information, 2012-2014 – Transition Point 3 (Exit)

	2012-2013	2013-2014
Degree	40	26

Table 6

Faculty Profile 2012-2014⁴

Status	2012-2013	2013-2014
Full-time TT/Lecturer	2	2
Part-time Lecturer	0	0
Total:	2	2

- 2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting. (See Attached)**

Two full-time faculty members reviewed and discussed the assessment findings. They also calibrated the scoring of one of the signature assignments during the “Beyond Compliance” Workshop Organized by the College of Education in September, 2014. A copy of the minutes are attached at the conclusion of this report.

Data

- 3. Question 3 is in 2 parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:**

The Early Childhood Education program draws upon data from a variety of sources for its ongoing program improvement processes, and for this biennial report in particular. Data informing this report include:

- **Enrollment and Headcount Data:** Enrollment and headcount data are provided by the department office (faculty headcounts) and the Graduate Office/TPAC. These data are reflected in Tables 2-6 above. The data are shared with the Assessment Office on an annual basis and reviewed in alternating years for the biennial report.

⁴ Faculty numbers reflect headcounts of any faculty member teaching a course in the program for the prior academic year (Summer through Spring). Faculty who teach across multiple programs will be counted in each program.

- **Signature Assignment Data:** Signature assignments are faculty-designed assessments, typically embedded in courses that assess candidate learning on program-level outcomes. Assessment scoring is guided by rubrics to ensure consistency and fairness. These data are collected each time the relevant course is offered and are then forwarded to the Assessment Office for analysis. Analysis includes calculating the mean and standard deviation for overall and criteria scores. Signature assignments are outlined in Table 1 (above). The data are reported in the figures below as well as in Appendix A of this report.
- **Exit Survey for Advanced Programs:** Each spring, the Assessment Office administers a web-based survey to those who have completed their programs and/or filed for a credential the prior summer or fall, or anticipate doing so that spring. Relevant data for the program are reported in Appendix B.
- **ECE Program Evaluation: Benchmark Survey .** Each year, the ECE MA program administers a Benchmark survey to students at the end of their first year in the program to gather candidate perceptions about the program. The surveys includes 58 items, both forced-choice and open-ended, under several categories: Faculty, program goals, advisement, peers, use of technology, program knowledge base, students in the program, leadership and advocacy, candidate professional involvement, future career gals, and overall appraisal (positive and suggestions) of the ECE Master's program. A sample of relevant survey data used to inform this report is included in Appendix B.
- **ECE Program Evaluation: Exit survey.** Each year, the ECE MA program administers an Exit Survey to students in the last semester in their program to gather candidate perceptions about the program. The surveys includes 64 items, both forced-choice and open-ended, under several categories: Faculty, program goals, advisement, peers, use of technology, program knowledge base, students in the program, leadership and advocacy, candidate professional involvement, future career gals, and overall appraisal (positive and suggestions) of the ECE Master's program. A sample of relevant survey data used to inform this report are included in Appendix B.
- **ECE Parent Workshop Survey.** Each year, students administer a survey (designed by the program) to parents after they provide a workshop to parents. The survey includes 10 items related to the workshop, forced choice and open-ended, and a background component. The survey is administered after about a month after program students offer a workshop to parents. The survey is intended to gather parental satisfaction or suggestions to improve the workshop. The survey provides an indirect measure to assess the effectiveness of student preparation in the program. Relevant data for the program are reported in Appendix B.

Additional information, including each program's assessment plan and signature assignments, can be found at: <http://www.ced.csulb.edu/assessment>.

- a. **Candidate Performance Data:** Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used).

The ECE program’s 7 SLOs were assessed on Taskstream using a 5 point rubric (0-4). The program keeps a target for all signature assignments, that is, to meet the rubric criteria between a high B - A levels. This target has been achieved in all program courses. The figures below present an overview of SLO data for the period covered by this report. For more detailed data on specific SLOs and related criteria (as available) please refer to Appendix A. For program pathways with fewer than 10 students, we do not disaggregate data.

Figure 1

Figure 1 displays aggregate data by SLO for a three-year period based on points earned.



Figure 2

Figure 2 displays trends in SLO data across three years based on points earned.



- b. **Program Effectiveness Data:** What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness.

The ECE program has reviewed and interpreted data from the following survey items (identified below). Relevant survey data can be found in Appendix B.

<u>Survey</u>	<u>Items</u>
ECE Benchmark Surveys, 2013	<u>2013:</u> Program goals: #8 Miscellaneous #6 ,#8 <u>2013:</u> Coursework: Item #3 and #5; ECE program: Item #4; General satisfaction: Item #3
CED Exit Survey, 2013; 2014	<u>2014:</u> ECE program: Item #5; Technology #4 Coursework: #5 <u>2013:</u> Advising support: Item #6; Program goals Item #9
ECE Program Exit Survey, 2013; 2014	<u>2014:</u> Miscellaneous: Items #6, #9;_narrative comments; Advising support Item #7
ECE Parent Workshop Survey, 2014	Items #4, #6, and narrative comments

4. **OPTIONAL:** You may provide *additional* information (e.g., other data, copies of letters of support from granting agencies or school staff, etc.) about candidate performance, the student experience or program effectiveness used to inform programmatic decision making. This may include quantitative and qualitative data sources.

Program candidates and graduates continue to amass numerous achievements in the professional field. Please see **Appendix C** for an in-depth overview of program effectiveness as gathered from student/graduate achievements including presenting at local/state/and national conferences, receiving awards/scholarships, pursuing doctoral degrees, and holding prestigious jobs.

Analysis and Actions

5. Please use the table below to report the major interpretations based on your review of the data for this reporting cycle. Consider signature assignment data on candidate performance *as well as* any survey and other data. Be sure to make note of how these new findings compare to *past* findings on the data and discuss *why* you believe the results have changed. (Note: While it is possible that you have both strengths and weaknesses for a single topic, it is also possible you might identify *only* strengths or *only* weakness for a topic.)

Table 7

Interpretations and Discussion of Program Strengths and/or Areas of Needed Improvement

#	Topic	Data Sources (i.e., Signature Assignments and/or surveys)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement (Please address action taken or planned in Q6 below)	Changes from past findings <i>and why</i>
1	APA style (SLO 1, 2, and 6)	Signature assignment	Students improved in using APA style in their writing over time.	Need improvement in APA style in the beginning semester.	<p><u>SLO 1:</u> There is decrease in students' competency in using APA style format between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. <u>Reflections:</u> The course is offered in students' first semester in the program. In addition, each entering cohort of students varies in their background knowledge and skill of using APA based on their undergraduate experience. The focus in the first semester is on mastering the content of the course as well as academic writing styles and organization. The data show that students' performance on the APA style format gradually improved during their two years in the program.</p> <p><u>SLO 2:</u> There is an increase in students' performance in APA style in SLO 2. <u>Reflections:</u> The assignments for Graduate level writing are challenging for English-speaking students, and more so for students whose English is their second language. We have a higher than normal number of students with English as their second language; nevertheless, their writing does improve with time. In addition, SLO 2 and 3 occur simultaneously in the spring. The instructor has an in-class APA activity the second week of the semester. This activity has increased the student's performance.</p> <p><u>SLO6:</u> There was improvement on this item. The improvement is due to constant reminder to check for APA errors and collaborative work among students.</p>

#	Topic	Data Sources (i.e., Signature Assignments and/or surveys)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement (Please address action taken or planned in Q6 below)	Changes from past findings <i>and why</i>
2	SLO #2, #3, and #6: Grammar and Organization	Signature assignment	Increased for some signature assignments	Need improvement in some signature assignments	<p><u>SLO 2:</u> There was a decrease between 2012 and 2013 on this rubric item as shown in the SLO charts. Graduate level writing is challenging for English-speaking students, and more so for students whose primary language is not English. We have a higher than normal number of students with English as their second language> Nevertheless, their writing does improve with time.</p> <p><u>SLO 6:</u> There is an increase between 2012 and 2013 as shown in the SLO charts. Students were encouraged to seek outside help with their grammar and organization.</p>
3	SLO #3: Planning a curriculum Strategy	Signature assignment	Most components were addressed at or above 90% level	Only two components of SLO 3 needing improvement that includes APA style which is discussed above	<p>Only 73% of students mastered the criterion.</p> <p>Reflection: This is students' first time discussing and applying theories of learning and teaching. One student in the 2012-2013 cohort plagiarized her paper and decided not to revise it. As a result, this brought down the criterion mean.</p>
4	SLO #5 (Rubric criteria: Services, Planning the physical facility, and the program for children)	Signature assignment	Most components were addressed at or above 90% level	Three rubric criteria for SLO 5 need improvement	<p><u>SLO 5:</u> Based on the criteria scores for this assignment, students seem to struggle with the following criteria: Services, Planning the physical facility, and the program for children.</p> <p><u>Reflections:</u> This is a large and demanding assignment. Students are strongly encouraged to work in groups and start the assignment early. Two students in the 2013-2014 cohort decided to complete the assignment alone. The instructor attempted to meet with them during the process; however, they decided not to meet with the instructor. Consequently, they were unable to complete the assignment. As a result, this brought down all the criteria means.</p>

#	Topic	Data Sources (i.e., Signature Assignments and/or surveys)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement (Please address action taken or planned in Q6 below)	Changes from past findings <i>and why</i>
5	SLO #7: Rubric criteria: Analysis of child rearing beliefs	Signature assignment	6 criteria are addressed at or above 90%	Criterion, "Analysis of child rearing beliefs" Needs improvement	Based on the criteria scores for this assignment, students seem to struggle with the following criterion: Analysis of Child Rearing Beliefs. <u>Reflections:</u> This criterion requires advanced level of thinking. Therefore, students might need more explicit modeling with examples from the instructor.
6	Group projects	ECE Benchmark survey; CED Exit surveys		Students' narrative comments on CED 2014 exit survey show that they did not like group projects.	<u>Reflections:</u> More full-time individuals are entering the program in recent years and have less time out of the class for planning group projects. In addition, there was a particular student (between 2012-2013) who had hard time working with others in the class.
7	Exposure to Experts in the field	CED exit surveys	Exposure to experts who served as guest speakers during the ECE spring mixer		CED Exit survey results show significant improvement between the 2013 and 2014 surveys. However, as per the ECE exit survey (2014), about 22% candidates had reservations about this item. <u>Reflections:</u> The program had invited a renowned guest speaker to 2013 annual spring mixer. In addition, selected program graduates who are working in high-ranking positions were invited as panelists to the 2014 annual spring mixer to share their expertise and work. However, as it is not a mandatory event, some students did not attend the event and missed this opportunity. The 3 students, who have negatively rated this item, might not have attended the mixer.
8	Advisement toward future career goals	CED Exit surveys; ECE 2014 exit surveys	Some exposure to various careers in the field of ECE during ECE spring mixer	Need more exposure to various careers in the field of ECE	The CED exit surveys show increased rating on this item. However, ECE exit surveys, which have higher participation rates, showed decreased rating. <u>Reflections:</u> The program invited 5 graduates from different careers in the field of ECE to its annual spring mixer. However, not all students attended the mixer. Student's s who did not attend could not get exposure to careers in the field.

#	Topic	Data Sources (i.e., Signature Assignments and/or surveys)	Strengths	Areas for Improvement (Please address action taken or planned in Q6 below)	Changes from past findings <i>and why</i>
9	Application of technology skills to academic and professional work	CED exit survey; ECE 2014 program exit survey	Change in students' satisfaction over time	Need further improvement	<p>The CED exit surveys show improvement on this item. However, the sample is too small for any valid interpretation. The 2014 ECE exit survey introduced this particular item. Only 88% students showed satisfaction with this item.</p> <p><u>Reflections:</u> The curriculum course is packed with content and incorporating technology has been too hard for the instructor.</p>
10	Parent satisfaction with the workshop provided by program students	ECE Parent workshop survey	Parent workshop survey		<p>Note: Only the year 2014 is presented. No data was collected in 2013. The 11 parents that responded to the survey reported their satisfaction with the workshop content and shared applying their learning from the workshop with their children.</p> <p>The weaknesses of the workshop, as perceived by parents, included time constraints and how the students presented the information during the workshop.</p> <p><u>Reflections:</u> Students spend a good amount of time working in this project.</p>

6. Please outline the steps the program will take (e.g., revise curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes) to address areas in need of improvement outlined in Question 5.

Table 8

Program Action Items

Topic #	Action to Address Areas for Improvement	By Whom?	By When?	Update on Actions (If Applicable)
1	<p><u>APA Style</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide APA style workshops to students in the first year courses. • Invite graduates to support individual students who struggle with the APA style 	<p>Program faculty</p> <p>Past graduates</p>	Fall 2015	In fall 2014, program graduates supported a group of students with their APA style.
2	<p><u>SLO #2, #3, and #6: Grammar and Organization</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite graduates to help first year students • Students are encouraged to visit the Writer's Resource Lab or Learning Assistance Center on campus, as well as recommended to take an extra writing course during the summer after their first year in the program. • encourage students to enroll in CED writing workshops • CED offers "writing workshops" on Saturdays and the program offers classes on Saturdays for first year students. Therefore, they cannot enroll in these workshops. The Program coordinator will discuss possibilities of offering alternate days for writing workshops with the associate dean for graduate studies in the College • Encourage students to work with the University's Writing Lab • Faculty members continue allowing students to revise their papers based on feedback. • 	<p>Coordinator</p> <p>Students</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Each Summer</p> <p>During the course</p>	In fall 2014, program graduates helped students in their signature assignment including grammar And organization Faculty members have encouraged students to enroll in CED writing workshops and work with the university writing lab personnel. Faculty members provide extensive feedback on major writing assignments and allow students to revise their papers.
3	<p><u>SLO #3:</u></p> <p>In preparation for this assignment, students will take an exam focused on theories.</p>	Course instructor	Spring 2015	
4	<p>SLO # 5:</p> <p>Students will be required to meet with the instructor twice during the semester to review their progress and address any questions they may have.</p>	Instructor	Spring 2015	

Topic #	Action to Address Areas for Improvement	By Whom?	By When?	Update on Actions (If Applicable)
5	<u>SLO #7:</u> Review the signature assignment and provide explicit modeling on how to write the analysis of child rearing beliefs section in the rubric	Course Instructor	Fall 2015	
6	<u>Group Projects</u> Eliminating group projects is not an option. Students must learn to work with others. Review the number and nature of group assignments and the policy for group assignments for some SLOs.	Individual Instructors	Fall 2015	
7	<u>Exposure to experts.</u> The Program has invited experts including program graduates to its annual spring mixer for the last two years. However, attending this event is not mandatory for students. Therefore, a few students miss out on these opportunities. <u>Action:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty members will track attendance in the mixer event and tally the number of attendees in the event with the number of candidates in the ECE program survey who sated that they were not exposed to experts in the field. Faculty may give extra credit to students for attending the event to encourage attendance. The program will continue bringing experts to its annual mixer. However, the program does not have money to provide experts fees for their time and travel which continues to pose a challenge to address this issue. Support from the Department and College will be very helpful. The program may explore this option. 	Faculty members/ program coordinator	Fall 2015 Spring 2016	The program had invited Louis Derman-Sparks, famous for her book, "Anti-bias curriculum" as a guest speaker to the program to the 2013 annual Spring mixer. The program had invite past graduates working in different careers as panelists to the program mixer in spring 2014

Topic #	Action to Address Areas for Improvement	By Whom?	By When?	Update on Actions (If Applicable)
8	<u>Career Advisement.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a section on various careers for students after they graduate from the program on the program website. • Request funding from the college for hosting a career-day for students during the annual spring mixer • Continue bringing past graduates who have joined various careers in the field to the annual spring mixer. • Bring guest speakers from various careers to program courses during the year. 	Coordinator	Fall 2015	
9	<u>Technology:</u> Conduct a need survey to identify: What technology do program students use and kinds of electronic equipment their work place (especially preschool programs) has and what technological support do they need for instructional purposes?	Program faculty	Fall 2015	
10	<u>Parent workshop survey:</u> Continue administering the Parent satisfaction survey and analyze the data	Course instructor	Spring 2015	

7. Will you be making any changes to signature assignments or rubrics as a result of your review of data for this report?

- Yes (see below)
- No (no further action is required)

If YES, please document planned changes below:

Table 9
Proposed Changes to Program Documents

Course #	Signature Assignment Name	Nature of Changes (BRIEF)	Reasons for Changes (BRIEF)

Please remember to submit revised rubrics to the Assessment Office when they are completed to ensure we can help you collect the correct data.

Data Discussion Guide Minutes

Early Childhood Education

Meeting Date: September 11, 2014

Attendance: Ruth Piker, Jyotsna Pattnaik

Student Learning

- Faculty calibrated the signature assignment from SLO #3 during the Beyond Compliance workshop organized by the college of education. It was found that the rubric does not reflect many of the expectations for the project. However, the instructor made it clear that she provides a detailed scoring sheet to supplement the rubric. The rubric cannot be too detailed as there is not enough space in the rubric. However, the rubric along with the scoring sheet captures the expectations for the assignment.
- Faculty felt that the idea of calibration was quite meaningful and can be repeated in later years.
- Faculty compared the program specific SLO data provided by the Assessment office in the College. Faculty members were satisfied with the overall student success in the program.
- Faculty perceived that students were getting better with the APA style writing and the content areas over time. Students seemed to struggle in theories and academic writing.
- The results showed fluctuations between the two academic years under review. For some SLOS, students' performance increased while for some others, the performance decreased.
- However, the results were not surprising.
- Faculty felt that these fluctuations are expected because of differenced in student backgrounds for various cohorts such as their primary language background, their experiences in the field, content background based on their undergraduate degree program, the family/personal challenges, personality of particular individuals, the time gap between their undergraduate and graduate program.
- Faculty felt that students need to understand the theories in the field better as these theories impact their curriculum and assessment practices.

Instrumental Utility

The program did not see any need for changing the course rubrics at this time. The rubrics seem to capture student learning specific to the SLOs.

Program courses and Practices

- The program has been utilizing technology for ensuring student success in the program. However, it is weak in incorporating technology that can support program candidates' instructional effectiveness with children/clients in their own work place. Program faculty discussed ideas to address this issue. These ideas are incorporated in the program report.
- Program faculty members do not have special education background. However, the program has invited a faculty member from the Special education department to discuss special education policies and practices with program students in one of the courses. Although not adequate, it is a starting point. The program will look for funding sources to invite special education experts to program courses in future.