



College of Education and Affiliated Programs  
Annual Assessment Report Spring 2010  
Master of Arts in Education 2010

School District might embed some of the DLD program content into professional development sessions for classroom teachers. Other school districts, such as the Anaheim Unified School district, have sought advice from the DLD coordinator on how to improve parental involvement in dual immersion programs.

Our DLD program faculty continue to seek opportunities for program outreach and for making an impact. For example, several of our DLD students have co-authored work and presented with our program faculty at national and international conferences. Additionally, several of our year 1 cohort DLD students are scheduled to participate in two different presentations with Dr. Leslie Reese and Dr. Trini Lewis at the California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE) in 2011. Dr. Trini Lewis will also present a workshop for parents and teachers in the Anaheim Unified School district during fall 2011 with several of the year 2 cohort DLD graduate candidates who recently graduated in spring 2010.

## Program Goals

The DLD program has eight distinct, yet inter-related program goals that are represented as course standard learning objectives (SLOs). The emphasis of the program goals/SLOs is to prepare graduate candidates with theoretical and research-based knowledge for improving the educational outcomes of culturally and linguistically students in an equitable manner. The program goals/SLOs focus on pedagogy, instruction and assessment and include a range of critical thinking skills for learning to synthesize, apply, analyze, and evaluate the professional literature with current research and practical classroom applications. The program goals/SLOs include (1) identify and analyze current multicultural and language issues and policies in the United States and globally; (2) evaluate the applicability of informal and formal assessment measures to determine their validity for language minority students; (3) demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical bases for language minority students in a curriculum module; (4) analyze and apply fieldwork data of students' home language & literacy practices in a classroom literacy plan to inform instruction; (5) synthesize published literature for informing an action research question related to the education of the language minority students; (6) apply knowledge of cognitive and societal bilingualism to a contemporary issue; (7) analyze and interpret data to address an action research question and (8) evaluate personal and professional stances with respect to language minority education in an ethically and socially responsible manner.

## Program Goals and Connection to CED Conceptual Framework

Since the DLD program is aimed at advancing teachers' knowledge and skills for working with culturally and linguistically diverse students in an equitable manner, the eight program goals/SLOs also reflect the College's six key ideas contained in the conceptual framework, such as (1) growth and learning; (2) social responsibility; (3) diversity; (4) service and collaboration; (5) school improvement; and (6) research, scholarship and evaluation.

**Growth and learning** is addressed by general implication throughout our eight program goals/SLOs and is not a key idea which exists independently. The five remaining key ideas from the CED Conceptual Framework are addressed and evident in specific program goals/SLOs associated with our program course work as described in the examples below.

**Social responsibility** is highlighted in our program goals/SLOs 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, & 8. Students are mentored to value their acquired theoretical knowledge about culturally and linguistically diverse students and to exercise their leadership skills to implement change within their school district, school, classroom and community settings. As a result, our students are actively engaged in sharing ideas that make a qualitative difference in the social lives of their students' families and in their own professional community. **Diversity** is embedded in all eight program goals/SLOs.



semester to the year 1 cohort. During the period under review, Dr. Rubio did not teach any classes in the DLD program.

Table 1  
 Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Outcome 6	Outcome 7	Outcome 8
<b>SLOs</b>	Identify and analyze current multicultural and language issues and policies in the U.S. and globally.	Evaluate the applicability of informal and formal assessment measures to determine their validity for language minority students.	Demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical bases for language minority students in a curriculum module (related to the teaching of reading/language arts and/or critical literacy).	Analyze and apply fieldwork data of students' home language & literacy practices in a classroom literacy plan to inform instruction.	Synthesize published literature for informing an action research question related to the education of language minority students.	Apply knowledge of cognitive and societal bilingualism to a contemporary educational issue.	Analyze and interpret data to address an action research question.	Evaluate personal and professional stances with respect to language minority education in an ethically and socially responsible manner.
<b>Signature Assignment</b>	International case study	Literacy assessment portfolio	Curriculum audit	Home & school events report	Research plan	Review of literature	Action research study	Final reflection

Conc

---



---

Table 2

Program Specific Candidate Information, 2008-2009 (snapshot taken F09) – Transition Point 1 (Admission to Program)

	Number Applied	Number Accepted	Number Matriculated
TOTAL	10	10	8

Table 3

Program Specific Candidate Information, 2008-2009 (snapshot taken F09) – Transition Point 2 (Advancement to Culminating Experience)

	Number
Thesis (698) <sup>1</sup>	0
Comps <sup>2</sup>	16
Project (695) <sup>3</sup>	0

Table 4

Program Specific Candidate Information, 2008-2009 (snapshot taken F09) – Transition Point 3 (Exit)

	Number
Degree	17

Table 5

Faculty Profile 2008-2009

Status	Number
Fulltime TT	4
Fulltime Lecturer	0
Part-time Lecturer	1
Total:	5

---

<sup>1</sup> This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2008 and Spring 2009. This figure may include students who

2. How many of the total full- and part-

Table 6  
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Signature

	Student Learning Outcomes	Signature Assignment(s)	Description of the Assignment
1	Identify and analyze current multicultural and language issues and policies in the U.S. and globally.	SCAE 564- Language and Educational Policies (Fall 2009)	DLD candidates select a country for further study of its linguistic history, issues, and policies.
2	Evaluate the applicability of informal and formal assessment measures to determine their validity for language minority students.	EDRG 551B-Assessment of Literacy with Bilingual Students (Fall 2009)	DLD candidates analyze pre- and post- formal and informal assessment information from classroom practice and apply such knowledge to inform knowledge about bilingual/English learners' literacy and language development.
3	Design a curriculum module related to the teaching of reading/language arts (including critical literacy across the curriculum) that applies knowledge of the major theoretical bases for language minority instruction.	EDCI 541-Designing Curriculum and Instruction in Primary and Second Language Settings, (Spring 2009)	Based on a needs assessment for English Language Learners and heritage speakers, DLD candidates interpret the data results for instructional purposes.
4	Analyze and apply fieldwork data of students' home language & literacy practices in a classroom literacy plan to inform instruction.	EDCI 532- Socialization of Literacy in More than One Language (not applicable due to a combined cohort configuration between C & I and DLD—this course was dropped from the program sequence for the cohort. Cohort year 2 took the class in Spring 2010)	DLD candidates complete a biliteracy events report that informs language and literacy development practices for students learning another language (L2) and or a primary language (L1) and their implications for instructional planning.
5	Synthesize published literature for informing an action research question related to the education of language minority students.	EDCI 533- Action Research Methods: Teachers as Inquirers. (Fall 2009)	DLD candidates complete a research plan and the foundation for the action research project to be completed in EDEL 695.
6	Apply knowledge of cognitive and societal bilingualism to a contemporary educational issue.	LING 650-Seminar in Bilingualism (not applicable, Cohort year 1 took this class in Fall 2008 and cohort year 2 will take the course in Fall 2010)	DLD candidates review literature on bilingualism as it relates to action research project.
7	Analyze and interpret data to address an action research question	EDCI 695- Seminar in Curriculum and Instruction (Spring 2009)	Using research plan, DLD candidates complete data collection, update lit review, analyze data and interpret findings.
8	Evaluate personal and professional stances with respect to language minority education in an ethically and socially responsible manner	EDCI 695- Seminar in Curriculum and Instruction (not-applicable;no data collected on this SLO during Spring 2009)	





Figure2

DLD Candidates' Mean Scores for SLOs 2, 3, & 7

Figure 3 below notes the percentage of DLD graduate candidate's rubric scores, 0-4 points for SLO 2 which is related to EDRG 551b, Assessment of Literacy with Bilingual Students. The signature assignment for SLO2 requires students to evaluate the applicability of informal and formal assessment measures to determine their validity for language minority students. The data reflects that a majority of the DLD graduate candidates received an overall of 4 points for SLO 2 and

DLD graduate candidates mean scores also ranged from 3.75-3.97. The data as represented in Figure 4 below provides evidence that the students developed and mastered the skills of describing, knowing, evaluating, analyzing and reflecting, as well as providing the evidence for the signature assignment in an appropriate written format. The scores for criteria 3, on evaluation,

In Figure 5 below students had a mean score of 3.86 with 12 scoring a 4, and only two students scoring 3. This score reflects the dedication and the skill development of the DLD graduate students who have great commitment to the profession and this particular course; all of the students were practicing teachers or at least credentialed graduates. The two students who scored 3 were either taking the course as an elective in another Master's program, or burdened with outside commitments and limitations which impacted their work and academic performance.

#### Figure 5

#### Mean Scores for SLO 3

In Figure 6 below the data indicates that students performed well in identifying professional/social situations than for examining curricular design. Additional attention might need to be given to effective ways for critically reviewing curriculum for strengths and challenge areas. Criterion 1 on analytical approach had the lowest mean score and deserves additional attention in course content and class activities for supporting students' understanding of analytical approaches. For ensuring meaningful interpretation of the data, additional criterion might need to be considered in a future rubric. The current rubric has three criterion and four or five criterion might provide additional variation for improving the analysis and interpretation of students' performance on the signature assignment.

On the first criterion: Analytical Approach, most of the students performed well, but less so than on the other criteria. Analytical approach demanded an analysis of critical p

Figure 6

Mean Scores for Criterion for SLO 3

Figure 7 below indicates that all students met expectations for SLO 7; however, one-third of the students passed at the 3 level. A closer examination of the students'

Figure 8 below indicates that students scored somewhat better on the findings and interpretation sections of the assignment than they did on the overall format of the action research study. As discussed in our DLD program meeting, part of this has to do with confusion regarding the review of literature and its place in providing a framework for the study. Dr. Leslie Reese also believes that the findings reflect students' ability to complete isolated tasks and continuing challenges in putting together the components the of action research project. For example, the data appears to suggest that students have difficulty with seeing how each component of the research process is connected to other research components.

## Figure 8

- 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. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.
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

Additionally, our DLD graduate candidates find our Master's program effective in meeting their personal and professional goals; however we do not currently have a measurement tool for capturing various forms of the data about student satisfaction and experiences beyond the

Program faculty also provide multiple scaffolds, such as providing feedback and opportunities for revision on written assignments to enhance instructional practices for ensuring students' success.

Additionally, the data for SLO2 as represented in Figure 4 above provided evidence that the students developed and mastered the skills of describing, knowing, evaluating, analyzing and reflecting, as well as in providing the evidence for the signature assignment in an appropriate written format. The scores for criteria 3, on evaluation, and criteria 5, on format, were the highest and reflected the students' abilities to evaluate formative and summative assessments for English learners and bilingual students, as well as understanding and addressing all of the significant components for the assignment pertaining to organization, writing, and adhering to APA reference standards.

### SLO 3

Students performed well in identifying professional/social situations and appear to have an understanding of theoretical works discussed in the course for providing insights about how curriculum reflects or does not reflect professional/social situations.

### SLO 7

According to DreJ-0.0gna1P ~~AMCID 2~~ xurP {alu)2e11(e)-ue5-7(f)11( 1)14rID 4 BDC -0.004 Tc 0.006 Tw T(S)-1(t)-6(u)-1(d)-1(e)-6(n



## Mini-research Seminars

In our 2009 report mini-research seminars were noted as an area for improvement to scaffold research design for our students. Knowledge about conducting research needed to be provided for students. (e) 10(d)(c) 4(a) 4(a) 53(p) 4(t) 6(1) 3(d) 5(d) J0 35(d1(e)-6(5(d1

