



**SAN FRANCISCO
STATE UNIVERSITY**

GRADUATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE DEAN

1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132-4158

Tel: 415/338-1031
Fax: 415/338-7019

**Graduate College of Education Annual Assessment Report
Office of Academic Planning
San Francisco State University
July 18, 2016**

Overview of Program Assessment in the GCOE

Academic Program Assessment is required by [Academic Senate Policy](#) of all Colleges and Departments at SF State for two purposes: (a) to inform and support program improvement; and (b) to meet accreditation and other external requirements. Program assessment in the GCOE is ongoing, in response to both of the above goals. This report highlights GCOE assessment activities for the AY 2015-2016, as part of continuous program improvement and accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC). In addition, due to the central nature of preparation of educators and speech-language pathologists in the GCOE, regular assessment systems and reports are completed for the CSU Chancellor's Office, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), American Speech-Language and Hearing Association/Council on Academic Accreditation (ASHA/CAA), and Association of the Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AER). Each of these professional accreditors determine program standards, program learning goals and student learning outcomes that are evaluated in formative and summative methods for program improvement and student achievement. Further, undergraduate and graduate degrees are structured to meet program learning goals and student learning outcomes that are related to program standards for promoting leadership in education and clinical settings.

The diversity of programs in the GCOE and multiple assessment requirements can be framed within the context of Academic Program Assessment that includes four components, outlined below. The stages in the program assessment cycle include the following:

1. *Mission Statement* – A brief statement of the values and principles that guide the curriculum and differentiates from other SF State programs;
2. *Program Learning Goals* – Statements of the knowledge and skills that are determined as essential for program graduates;
3. *Assessment Findings* – Results from examining evidence of student learning in light of program learning goals; and
4. *Response/Closing the Loop* – Actions taken to respond to assessment findings.

Each of the GCOE Departments and related Programs demonstrate differing stages of Program Assessment, based on the above. Highlights of assessment processes are included regarding College and Department activities for the past AY, 2015-2016.

GCOE Mission, Vision, and Strategic Directions. Since fall 2014, the GCOE has engaged in strategic planning to develop and develop a comprehensive program assessment system. Achievements in the past AY focused primarily on refining the [GCOE Mission, Vision and Strategic Directions](#), shown on the GCOE website. In AY 2016-2017, Program Assessment will focus on the development of a Unified Assessment System (UAS) that follows the assessment cycle, outlined above and draws upon reporting required throughout the AY, including the following formative and summative measures and others to be developed:

- SF State: APRC & Academic Program Development Reports
- ERRS Reports: Chancellor's Office Credential Enrollment reports
- ERST Reports: Chancellor's Office Credential Completer reports
- Title II: Program Requirements & Completers of Selected Credential Programs
- CTC Biennial Reports: Achievement of Signature Assignments
- CTC Biennial Reports: Student Teaching Observations
- CTC Biennial Reports: Educator Mastery (EdTPA and other TPA measures)
- CTQ: Chancellor's Office Program Completer Exit Survey
- CTQ: Chancellor's Office Educator One-Year Employment & Employer Survey
- ASHA Annual Report regarding CD Program and Student Outcomes
- SF State Graduate Degree Exit Surveys

Education Minor Program Learning Goals. The revision of the EDUC Minor was conducted through extensive collaboration across GCOE Departments in series of meetings with Department Chairs and the EDUC Minor Task Force. Resulting PLOs and curriculum were developed through input from representatives of each Department in the GCOE and include the following:

1. Develop a social justice educational philosophy that articulates the role of educators as agents of change.
2. Develop advocacy skills to build inclusive and supportive classroom communities for all students.
3. Prepare future educators to apply culturally responsive pedagogy to classroom environments.
4. Develop content appropriate instructional strategies that maximize learning for all students
5. Develop interpersonal skills to interact professionally in educational environments.
6. Develop and participate in research in teaching and learning.
7. Explore and apply the arts as integral to a comprehensive educational experience
8. Integrate multiple literacies into learning environments.

Following approval of the Revised EDUC Minor by the Academic Senate in April 2016, the curriculum scheduled for implementation in fall, 2016. Program assessment will be conducted in AY 2016-2017 to determine the effectiveness of the PLOs to guide student-learning outcomes.

Program Learning Goals in Educator Preparation. In the new AY, 2016-2017, assessment will focus on the development and updating of Program Learning Goals in all Departments in the GCOE. In particular, CTC recently authorized revised Program Standards for Education Administrators and related changes in curriculum are required to be submitted to CTC

this fall. In June 2016, the CTC also authorized new standards and Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials. Further, TPEs for Special Educators (Education Specialists) are also under review and scheduled for revision in the coming year. The emphasis in new standards on inclusion of **all** students, universal design for learning, instructional technology, culturally responsive pedagogy and collaboration will require extensive curriculum planning and development across the College.

The following sections provide brief summaries of Department assessment activities for the AY, 2015-2016.

Department of Elementary Education

Department Contact: Josie Arce, Chair

Department Programs, AY 2015-2016:

Degrees

- [Early Childhood Education MA](#)
- [Elementary Education MA](#)
- [Language and Literacy Education MA](#)
- [Mathematics Education MA \(EED\)](#)

Credentials

- [Bilingual Authorization in Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin \(with Multiple Subject Teaching Credential\)](#)
- [Multiple Subject \(Elementary School\) Teaching Credential](#)
- [Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential](#)

Graduate Certificates

- [Reading and Literacy Added Authorization](#)

Revised Mission Statement for the Multiple Subject Program, Teaching in Diverse Elementary Settings (TIDES) and Bilingual Authorization. As stated in the MSC Student Handbook, the philosophy for TIDES stems from the belief that teachers can be advocates for social justice and agents of change to achieve equity for all students. In addition, the Spanish bilingual program Bilingual Educators for Social Transformation (BEST) is an integral part of TIDES. This philosophy or mission statement is also written in our accreditation report to CTC for the bilingual programs. We also provide a Chinese bilingual program. The Bilingual Authorization programs embraces broad concepts of social justice and equity, however, we take a more focused philosophical stance stemming from critical pedagogy and rooted in bilingual education. One of our aims is to provide a focused process where Spanish and Chinese bilingual preservice candidates engage in critical dialogue, and participate in field placements that support a transformative philosophy of education and leverage knowledge about the country of origin where the K-6 students or their parents come from. It is highly probable that our bilingual credential candidates undergo a process of developing social consciousness or refine their consciousness as they proceed in the program through reflections about the legal and historical

foundations of bilingual education in the United States and specifically in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The process used to originally develop the mission statement for TIDES and BEST was conducted through meetings with six TT faculty members, bilingual and non-bilingual, and shared in a faculty meeting in 2014-2015. We have had many informal discussions on the need to update our mission statement especially as we consider new research and issues addressing equity. Culturally responsive pedagogy seems to encompass our program learning goals to prepare preservice candidates to teach culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in California. At this time, we are engaged in updating the mission statement and plan to complete this process by fall 2016.

The Department of Elementary Education is working on expanding and clearly defining our mission that reflects our commitment to preparing preservice and experienced teachers to become competent and experts in integrating pedagogical content knowledge and culturally responsive pedagogy, inclusion pedagogy for students with learning challenges. These frameworks are the foundations that we believe build successful teachers who can more effectively support student social and academic achievement.

Assessments Findings. In each of our curriculum and instruction courses we have signature assignments that provide formative and summative evaluation of students' competencies and meeting program-learning goals. These signature assignments are required in one to three semesters. Our data indicates that students pass in high numbers. Those who do not pass are allowed to revise if overall scores in all areas are 1, 1, and 2. We have documented data through Task Stream reports, kept at the Department level. These were tied to PACT. Under EdTPA we do not need to report Signature Assignment (previously CAT scores). Faculty has continued to use Task Stream and CAT scores that are strong indicators of students meeting program-learning goals.

Examples of Signature Assignments: Formative Assessment

Course	Signature Assignment & Rubric
ED 777 Curriculum and Instruction: Science	Designing, planning and teaching a two-day lesson plan on science. Content Assessment Rubric is used to evaluate, scale 1-3.
EED 782 Teaching Reading and Language Arts	Signature assignment: Designing, planning and teaching a two-day lesson plan on reading and language arts. Content Assessment Rubric is used to evaluate, scale 1-3.
EED 737 Literacy, Social Studies and Social Justice	Signature assignment: Designing, planning and teaching a two-day lesson plan on integrated literacy and social studies. Content Assessment Rubric is used to evaluate, scale 1-3.
EED 784 Curriculum and Instruction: Mathematics	Signature assignment: Designing, planning and teaching a two-day lesson plan on mathematics. A formal rubric is

	not used because the summative assessment for EdTPA is a math teaching event for the completion the MSC
--	---

Student Teaching Assessment: Formative and Summative

Master Teacher Evaluations (7 th and 15 th week)	University Supervisor Evaluation
Final Student Teaching Evaluation each semester are critical to evaluating students' competencies and meeting the program learning goals. These are both narrative and rating 1-3 on competencies.	University Supervisor Evaluation of student teachers in their field placement is used throughout the programs (one-calendar year program, bilingual three semesters and the three-semester program). This observation assessment includes the 13 Teaching Performance Assessments, including the application of culturally responsive teaching.

Students have been more comfortable with the signature assignments since we have stopped the CAT reporting. Previously under CAT/PACT if they did not pass CATs they could not pass the course. Now under the signature assignments they are able to revise and experience a more authentic learning experience without the high-stakes testing assignment weighing on them.

The signature assignments help the content specific faculty evaluate common instructional themes, addressing program-learning goals and allow for more collaboration within faculty.

Our students benefit because they evolve in their competencies over the semesters to design, plan, implement and assess quality lesson plans. These signature assignments are precursors to planning for the EdTPA.

Areas to Further Develop. Our future plan in the next two years, 2016-18, is to include universal design and culturally responsive pedagogy explicitly as we prepare to learn more about these areas and how to better prepare our candidates. In August, 2016 we will sponsor our first all day mandatory orientation to the MSC program. Our primary aim is to introduce students into the progression of our program and programs within the MSC. A major finding underlying this mandatory orientation is that many current candidates do not comprehend the signature assignments as a developmental process toward the major high-stake EdTPA teaching event. We believe they need an introduction into the MSC program learning goals and to revisit these throughout the duration of their program.