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?

dZ  D •š Œ [ • ] v  Œ o Ç  Z ] o Z } }   µ  š ] } v ~  • ‰ Œ } P Œ u  š  ^ h >  ] •
student body with updated knowledge and skills (including leadership skills) necessary to fulfill

Table 2

Program Specific Candidate Information, 2012-2014

Table 5

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

|  | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 |
|---|---|---|
| Degree | 40 | 26 |

Table 6

Faculty Profile 2012-2014

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

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.

]š]}v o ]v(}Œu š]}vU ]v oµ ]vP Z ‰Œ}PŒ u[ ]gnments, can š ‰o v v be found at: http://www.ced.csulb.edu/assessment

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

The program's Signature Assessments on Task 5. The master's 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

b. <u>Program Effectiveness Data</u>:  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.

| Survey | Items |
|---|---|
| ECE Benchmark Survey 2013 | 2013: Program goals: #5 Miscellaneous #6 , #8 |
| CED Exit Survey 2013 | |

## 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*

| # | 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 and why |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 strug with the following criterion: Analysis of Child Rearing Beliefs.

Reflections: This criterion requires advanced level of thinking. Therefo students might need more explicit modeling with examples from the instructor. |
| 6 | | | | | |

| # | 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 and why |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Application of technology skills to academic and professional work | CED exit survey, ECE 2014 program exit survey | Change in •š µ   v š • [ satisfaction over time | Need further improvement | 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. 

Reflections: The curriculum course is packed with content |

6.

| Topic # | Action to Address Areas for Improvement | By Whom? | By When? | Update on Actions (If Applicable) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | SLO #7:<br>Review the signature assignment and provide explicit modeling on how to write the analysis of child rearing Q (( ch)-6(ild | | | |

| Topic # | Action to Address Areas for Improvement | By Whom? | By When? | Update on Actions (If Applicable) |
|---------|------------------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------------|
|         |                                          |          |          |                                   |

Faculty calibrated the signature assignment from SLO #3 uring 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, •š µ   v š • [ ‰  Œ ( } Œ u  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 the theories impact their curriculum and assessment practices.

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.

The program has been utilizing technology for ensuring student success in the program. , } Á   À   Œ U   ] š   ] •   Á    I   ] v   ] v   } Œ ‰ } Œ  š ] v P  š   Z v } o } P Ç  š Z  š    v •  µ ‰ ‰ } 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.