

2016-2017 Education Master Programs
Program Review

Program Review Guidebook for Academic Departments 2016-2017

Education master programs - Education, Teaching, TESOL

Overview

PROGRAM REVIEW: INTRODUCTION

A program review is a systematic process for evaluating and improving academic programs. It is conducted through self-evaluation and peer evaluation by external reviewers, with an emphasis on assessing the quality and degree of student learning within the program. The comprehensive analysis which the review provides and the resulting Memorandum of Understanding are used to stimulate curriculum and programmatic changes and to inform planning and budgeting processes at various levels. The program review cycle occurs every five years.

Program review is a required element in WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) accreditation and has been a part of Pepperdine's assessment cycle since 2003. While data provides the foundation for effective program review, assessment of student learning, and other quality improvement strategies, the data must be turned into evidence and communicated in useful formats. The program review does this.

When implemented effectively and followed up deliberately, program review is a powerful means for engaging faculty, staff, and administrators in evaluating and improving programs to enhance student learning. The review process is an opportunity to refine a program to meet the changing needs of student learning, retention, curriculum in various disciplines, and student support services. It is also a purposeful opportunity to link decision-making, planning, and budgeting with evidence.

This guidebook provides a framework and resources to help with the review.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The process is intended to be meaningful, foremost, for the department and its enhancement of student learning. As a result, the process is flexible in order to serve the needs of both small and large programs as well as academic, co-curricular, and student support programs. The review should be a collaborative process involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students in order to align more effectively the college or department with institutional goals and objectives.

Two guiding principles are embedded in this Guidebook and are consistent with WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) standards:

*** Ongoing Evaluation of What Students Learn:**

Evidence-based program review includes: a review of program learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of the outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results, retention/graduation rates, core competencies, and other outcomes data over a multi-year period.

*** Quality Assurance, Planning, and Budgeting Decisions Based on Evidence:**

The results of the program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels.

PREPARATION FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

The program chair is responsible for the planning of the review. An internal committee or working group should be developed to allocate responsibilities for writing the program review including data collection, writing, and use of resources. It is recommended that a meeting occur between the committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to review data needs.

PROGRAM ALIGNMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY, MISSION, AND INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

Program reviews focus on the meaning, quality, and integrity of a program as it relates to student learning and the mission of Pepperdine:

Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.

Each department carries out the University mission and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs are formed by two components:

- * Core commitments: knowledge and scholarship, faith and heritage, and community and global understanding
- * Institutional values: purpose, service, and leadership

Each basic commitment is seen through the lens of three essential institutional values drawn from the University mission statement: purpose, service, and leadership. These basic commitments should link to measurable objectives as stated in the student learning outcomes (SLOs).

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMPONENTS

Program review at Pepperdine University is conducted on a five-year review cycle that involves three main components and six steps (see diagram below):

SELF STUDY:

- An in-depth, internal analysis written by program faculty/staff
- Department faculty or program staff (for co-curricular and student support services) conduct a departmental self-study within guidelines provided in the Guidebook. This portion of the review identifies program strengths and limitations, and suggests solutions to identified problems.

EXTERNAL & INTERNAL REVIEWS:

- An external review conducted by an outside expert in the field or discipline. The Guidebook describes how to secure qualified, objective external reviewers, including those with understanding and experience in addressing student learning outcomes assessment. Once the self-study is completed, the external review is organized.
- An internal review by the Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC)

CLOSING THE LOOP:

- A Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) developed by the department
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) developed by the dean

Closing the Loop is used to describe the act of making decisions based on evidence. The most important product of a program review is the advancement of student learning.

Therefore, the program review cycle ends by identifying evidence-based changes in the QIP, and then the MOU explains how the plan will be supported and carried out over the next five years.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Please find the link below for the 'GLOSSARY OF TERMS'.
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B6ufJTogPx32TmZjU19JZ3FTM00>**

INTRODUCTION

Reviews begin with an introduction that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and should include:

1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

This begins with an overview of the program describing (as appropriate).

- a. where the program is situated (school/division),**
- b. degrees granted, concentrations available, programs offered**
- c. where is the program located (campus location)**
- d. Provide a brief history of the program**
- e. Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.**

Pepperdine University has a strong heritage of preparing educators. From Pepperdine's inception in 1937, the discipline of education has played a prominent role in the academic program of the institution. Originating on the Los Angeles campus, Pepperdine's Teacher Preparation Program was reorganized into a professional School of Education in 1971. Shortly thereafter, the undergraduate teacher education program moved to the Malibu campus in 1975 while the Teacher Preparation Graduate Program remained on the Los Angeles campus. In January 1981, the graduate Division of Psychology became part of the Graduate School of Education, and in March 1982, it officially became the Graduate School of Education and Psychology (GSEP).

From the start, the teacher preparation programs at Pepperdine University offered at undergraduate and graduate campuses functioned as two distinct entities. However, in the spring term of 2004, the Dean of the GSEP was appointed by the Provost as the institutional representative with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) for all credentialing programs. CCTC now requires that all preliminary teacher preparation programs offered by an institution, regardless of pathway, be aligned into one cohesive program. To meet that requirement, significant work was done during the academic years 2010-12 to redesign the Multiple/Single subject teacher preparation programs into a single, unified set of coursework. As part of the curriculum redesign, faculty members began the process of aligning coursework and collaborating in the development of new program syllabi for implementation in fall term 2012, to ensure compliance in the transition period. This review included the integration of the undergraduate and graduate teacher certification programs and development of consistent practices at the three graduate campuses (West Los Angeles, Encino, and Irvine).

Under the direction of the Dean of the GSEP, and with full support from the Dean of Seaver College, this endeavor has been extensive and rewarding. Key stakeholders (professional educators, colleagues, collaborative school sites) have supported the formation of a re-designed program that will equip educators in the 21st century more effectively than before. The new curriculum for the teaching credential program was submitted to the University

Academic Council and was approved to launch at the graduate level in fall term 2012, and at the undergraduate level in fall 2013. The leadership organizational chart is presented in Appendix A and the current coursework requirements are presented in Appendix B. The program currently has two primary pathways: (a) Undergraduate Program - assumes an ongoing relationship between undergraduate courses and the Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program (TPP). Candidates may complete the TPP during their undergraduate work, or complete the final phase of the program at the postgraduate level. Most multiple subject teacher candidates in the undergraduate pathway earn bachelor's degrees in Liberal Arts and the single subject candidates earn degrees in the content area they intend to teach. This pathway is only offered at the undergraduate campus and is administered by the Humanities and Teacher Education division of Seaver College.

Candidates follow a traditional model of classroom instruction. (b) Graduate Fifth Year Program - assumes successful completion of an accredited undergraduate degree prior to entering the Pepperdine TPP. This program is generally offered at four educational centers: West Los Angeles; Irvine; Encino; and Westlake Village. The graduate pathway is delivered in a blended format with 60% of instruction delivered in face-to-face sessions and 40% delivered in synchronous and asynchronous formats. Pepperdine's TPP offers two California credentials: (1) the SB2042 Preliminary Multiple Subjects Credential typically for those who want to teach elementary school and (2) the SB 2042 Preliminary Single Subject Credential typically for those who want to teach middle or high school. All candidates, after successfully completing the CCTC approved coursework and requirements, are recommended to the CCTC for a multiple or single subject credential.

2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT

This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline.

External Context

Pepperdine's TPP faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of the teacher credentialing programs in multiple ways. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Monthly Teacher Preparation Faculty Meetings – included in these meetings over the last couple of years were all full-time and part-time faculty, Program Director of Teacher Education, Director and Assistant Directors of Student Teaching, Dean of GSEP, Associate Dean of Education for GSEP, and the Director of Assessment and Accreditation.

2. Monthly Administrators' Meetings – included in these meetings are the Dean of GSEP, Program Director of Teacher Education, Associate Dean of Education for GSEP, Associate Dean of Seaver College, Seaver College's Humanities/Teacher Education Division Chair, Director of Student Teaching, and Undergraduate Program Coordinator

3. Faculty retreats during program development – included all parties identified above, as well as invited guests. These have included adjunct faculty, Educational Technology faculty and staff, and presenters on various education topics.

4. Advisory Council – meets periodically as scheduled by the Dean – includes the Dean of GSEP, Associate Dean of Education, K-12 educational partners, community members, and university faculty and administrators.

In addition to these regular meetings, the Director and Assistant Directors of Student Teaching are in continual contact with master teachers, field supervisors, and K-12 administrators in their work with candidate placements. While formal evaluation is essential, the TPP has found that maintaining close communication with Pepperdine partners and advisors in the greater community is also essential. Often communication related to evaluation is maintained electronically and/or on an informal basis. Email communication with K-12 school district partners and others who support the program keeps the awareness of needs and issues current.

Verbal feedback from these connections is brought to faculty meetings for discussion.

Additionally, written feedback is provided from these parties relating to the work of student teaching candidates. An additional form of feedback is gathered through the Comprehensive Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation conducted annually by an independent organization. This survey contacts 1st year teachers and their employers regarding program effectiveness for teacher preparation.

Program evaluation has been a major influence in ongoing improvement of the TPP. Program design elements continue to be aligned with the legislative changes for all credentials, but program changes have been made based on valuable feedback from candidates and the strategic

alliances with K-12 school districts to address specific changes and modifications to programs that prepare teachers and administrators. Partnerships with local districts assist in framing program decisions.

School districts are chosen primarily for the following reasons:

- Willingness of site administrators to participate in the program and the availability of qualified supervising teachers;
- Adherence to state curriculum requirements;
- Opportunities for linguistic and cross-cultural experiences afforded by these districts;
- Identifiable self-renewing schools in which student needs and student work are the focus;
- Opportunities for candidate self-evaluation and reflection are provided;
- Qualitative and quantitative in-service are provided;
- Community involvement is sought; and
- Proximity to the campus, especially for those field experiences in which students spend shorter periods of time at the school site.

The graduate pathway currently has one official Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Conejo Valley Unified School District in partnership with EARTHHS (formerly Manzanita Elementary), as a Professional Development School (PDS).

A more informal partnership is held with Glenwood Elementary School – also in Conejo Valley School District. Pepperdine works actively with urban schools in Southgate and Green Dot Public Schools, as well as a large number of local school districts and has developed fieldwork/internship relationships with numerous other schools in the greater Los Angeles area, noted below.

Faculty members regularly and systematically collaborate with members of the broader professional community to more fully support teaching candidates and improve the teacher education program. A few areas of involvement include:

- Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)
- Independent California Colleges and Universities Council on the Education of Teachers
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the California Council of Teacher Educators (CCTE)
- EARTHHS –PDS Partnership
- Glenwood School - PDS Partnership
- So. CA PDS Consortium
- Reading Forums – RICA

- Beverly Hills/Culver City BTSA & Induction Program
- Tri-County GATE Council Best Practices Conference
- Animo Leadership Academy
- CABA, AERA

Regarding the MAE/TP program, there were external factors, including a change in the titles of pathways to programs, enabling us to become more competitive in the education recruiting market. After conducting a brief analysis of the causes contributing to our under enrollment for the Master of Arts in Education programs, we realized that the most prominent and comparable institutions used a different brand in recruiting students, which proved to be successful. In an attempt to align our marketing practices with those of our competition, we changed the titles of our three program strands to three separate programs: Without making any changes to the course/program content, the names of the strands in the Master of Arts in Education/ Teacher Preparation will become effective for the fall 2015 term:

Program Titles[rg1]

- MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING (MAT)
 - The words “teaching credential” should not be associated in the Pepperdine programs as the credential being issued by the state and not by Pepperdine.
 - The MATP title is being changed to MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching) because it is a well-known, organic search online.
 - Internal faculty and staff can use term “Teacher Preparation.” There are both undergraduate (at Seaver) and graduate programs.
 -
- MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION (MAE)
 - This program is for those with a credential who want to pursue a Master’s Degree.
 - This program is the same as the Educational Psychology pathway.
 - This program will be grandfathered out in a few years and GSEP will add a Master’s in Special Education.
 -

MASTER OF ARTS IN TESOL (TESOL)

This program will remain the same as in the previous pathway.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

OUTCOMES

INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-1-KS	Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-2-FH	Demonstrate value centered leadership.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.L-3-CGU	Demonstrate global awareness.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-1-KS	Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-2-FH	Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.P-3-CGU	Understand and value diversity.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-1-KS	Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-2-FH	Incorporate faith into service to others.
CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-3-CGU	Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.

MISSION

3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program's mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes.

- a. **Mission** - This should be a general explanation of why the program exists, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and the program's essential nature, its values, and its work.
- b. **Goals** are general statements of what the program wants to achieve.
- c. **Outcomes** are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.

The program's purpose, goals, and outcomes should relate to and align with the mission and goals of the college and of the University.

Pepperdine University's mission reads:

Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership. Pepperdine University implements this mission through a variety of educational programs. In each school and program, the University strives for:

- (1) An excellent and demanding educational experience that focuses on the student as the heart of the learning experience, and

(2) A values-centered focus that challenges the student to examine the moral, ethical, and spiritual dimensions of learning and life.

Growing out of this institutional mission, Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program developed the following mission, goals, and outcomes.

Mission Statement

Pepperdine University TPP is a collaborative learning community of university students, supported by a network of teacher educators, K-12 practitioners and community members, embedded in a faith-based heritage and commitment to global understanding. The distinctive programs provide integrated experiential learning opportunities for candidates to become reflective teachers who practice sensitivity and responsiveness to the diverse needs of students, demonstrate a deep and flexible understanding of pedagogical content knowledge, and engage in theoretically grounded instructional methodologies.

Pepperdine TPP is committed to: A Learning Community Committed To The Education Of The Whole Individual. We believe that all coursework must address the holistic needs of our students, exploring the intellectual, spiritual and emotional dimensions of becoming a teacher. We believe that becoming a teacher involves the difficult work of discovering meaning, developing identity and discerning a pedagogical approach.

Praxis – Linking Theory To Practice.

We believe that teacher candidates learn best when they are engaged with teachers in real classrooms, confronting the daily issues of teaching. Coursework is linked to classroom experiences through rigorous explorations of theoretical foundations, solid research-based methodologies and the art of reflective practice.

Engagement In Improving the Educational Opportunities For The Least Well-Served.

We believe in sustained involvement with urban schools in meeting the needs of all learners, and in that endeavor, work closely with underserved schools in communities surrounding our centers.

Working in Partnership Schools & Communities With Guidance from an Advisory

Board. We believe in the necessity of authentic collaboration and in the generative power of multiple perspectives. Our Advisory Council, comprised of educators, community members and stakeholders, is committed to provide the program with external support, accountability and guidance.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

CURRICULUM MAP

I - Introduced
D - Developed
M - Mastered

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

2016_2017_Course_Sequence_Matrix.pdf

MAT_Handbook_2016_2017_New_Sequence.docx

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Meaning

Analysis of Direct Student Learning: Meaning Quality and Integrity

The university is required to define and ensure a distinctive and coherent educational experience for each of its degree programs. The findings from the program assessment and analysis process should explain how effectively courses, curricula, the co-curriculum, and other experiences are structured, sequenced, and delivered so that students achieve learning outcomes at the expected levels of performance in core competencies in their majors or fields of specialization, in general education, and in areas distinctive to the institution. It means ensuring alignment among all these elements, and maintaining an assessment infrastructure that enables the institution to diagnose problems and make improvements when needed. Direct student learning, an examination of how well students are meeting the program learning outcomes, should come from the past four years of annual assessments.

(2013 WSCUC Accreditation Handbook.)

Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:

4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes? How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

CREDENTIAL

Knowledge and Scholarship Faith and Heritage Community and Global Understanding

Purpose

(1) know theories of learning for instructional time (TPE 10)

(2) fulfill professional, legal, and ethical obligations (TPE 12)

(3) plan instruction for all students (TPE 9) and teach English learners (TPE 7)

Service

(4) know develop mentally appropriate teaching practices(TPE 6), demonstrate specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instructions (TPE 1)

(5) monitor student learning during instruction (TPE 2)

(6) know the concept of human engagement (TPE 5) and know how to make content accessible (TPE 4)

Leadership

(7) interpret and use assessments (TPE 3) and know theories of development for learning about students (TPE 8)

(8) seek professional growth as an educator and lifelong learner (TPE 13)

(9) create a social environment (TPE 11)

MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Knowledge and Scholarship Faith and Heritage Community and Global Understanding

Purpose

(1) understand the language of their profession

(2) embrace identity as scholar practitioners

(3) articulate a philosophy of differentiated learning

Service

(4) incorporate critical feedback into their work

(5) apply theories of human development

(6) develop a research project in the workplace

Leadership

(7) present their work in a professional setting

- (8) formulate personal learning goals
 (9) collaborate in a community of practice

Course Level Student Learning Outcomes

List courses from which student work samples were drawn. Based on the syllabi, list each course number and title and the name of the faculty member who taught the course.

Master of Arts in Education (MAE)

PHASE 1 (INTRODUCTION)	PHASE 2 (DEVELOPMENT)	PHASE 3 (MASTERY)
MATP 600: Human Development (4 units)	MATP 691: Action Research 1 (3 units)	MATP 692: Action Research 2 (3 units)
MAED 620: Learning Theory (3 units)	MAED 640: Ed Foundations (3 units)	MAED 650: Multiple Literacies (3 units)
MAED 630: Prof Identity/Lead (3 units)	MAED 670: Self in Social World (4 units)	MAED 671: Cog /Instr /Assess (4 units)
TOTAL UNITS= 10 units	TOTAL UNITS= 10 units	TOTAL UNITS= 10 units

Master of Arts in Education (MAE) – 5 Term Pathway (Approved 12-1-15)

Term 1	Term 2	Term 3	Term 4	Term 5
MATP 600: Human Development (4 units)	MAED 640: Ed Foundations (3 units)	MAED 650: Multiple Literacies (3 units)	MAED 630: Prof Identity/Lead (3 units)	*MATP 692: Action Research 2 (3 units)
MAED 620: Learning Theory (3 units)	MAED 670: Self in Social World (4 units)	MAED 671: Cog /Instr /Assess (4 units)	*MATP 691: Action Research 1 (3 units)	
TOTAL UNITS= 7 units	TOTAL UNITS= 7 units	TOTAL UNITS= 7 units	TOTAL UNITS= 6 units	TOTAL UNITS= 3 units

Fall 2014 Course Number	Fall 2014 Course Title	Faculty Member(s)	Course SLOs	Related PLOs
MAED 600	Human Development	Dr. Garcia-Ramos	3	5,7
MAED 620	The Learning Theory	Dr. Harding	1,3	4

Spring 2015 Course Number	Spring 2015 Course Title	Faculty Member(s)	Course SLOs	Related PLOs
MAED 640	Educational Foundations	Dr. Collatos	4	1, 6
MAED 671	Cognition	Dr. Green	1,2,3	
MAED 691	Action Research	Dr. Collatos	4	1, 6

Summer 2015 Course Number	Summer 2015 Course Title	Faculty Member(s)	Course SLOs	Related PLOs
MAED 650	Multiple Literacies	Varun Khanna	1,4	4,6

MAED 692	Action Research	Dr. Collatos	4	6
MAED 630	Professional Identity MMAED	Dr. Oliver	1,3	

5. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities? Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.

MAT Program Curriculum

Over a two year period, the Pepperdine Teacher Education faculty at Seaver and the GSEP met to redesign curriculum and develop a coordinated program with an offering of an undergraduate credential pathway and a MA /credential pathway. This unification was prompted by: (1) a mandate by the state accrediting agency, the California Commission on Teacher Credential (CCTC), that we function as one program, (2) an interest in pursuing national accreditation through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), formerly NCATE, which requires that we operate as one program, and (3) a request from the Provost to offer a more coordinated program. The new curriculum is a total of 34 units (a reduction from 47 units in the graduate pathway and from 35 (MS) and 36 (SS) in the undergraduate pathway) and has a greater emphasis on integration between the clinical experience and the course work theory to practice integration. The new curriculum was implemented in Fall 2012 at the graduate school and in Fall 2013 at Seaver due to differing SAC and UAC deadlines at Seaver and GSEP. Technology, diversity, and special populations were embedded in courses throughout the program. It also placed the program in line with Pepperdine's peer institutions who offer the masters and credential for 30-32 units.

MAE: TESOL Course Descriptions[rg1]

EDTE 601 LANGUAGE ANALYSIS

Candidates will study major concepts, theories, and research related to language analysis, demonstrate understanding of language as a system and competence in helping students acquire and use English in listening, speaking, reading, and writing for social and academic purposes.

EDTE 602 LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Candidates will know, understand, and use major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language to construct learning environments that support students' language and literacy development and content area achievement.

EDTE 603 INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Candidates will know, understand, and use major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture to construct learning environments that support students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement.

EDTE 604 CLASSROOM INQUIRY

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of history, research, and current practice in the field of second language teaching, and apply this knowledge to their practice through the development of a research proposal. The small-scale study will be conducted during the clinical practicum.

EDTE 605 LANGUAGE CURRICULUM

Candidates will know, understand, and apply standards-based practices to plan instruction in a supportive learning environment, and serve as effective English language models in multilevel classrooms with diverse learners, and explore a range of resources and technologies.

EDTE 606 LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY

Candidates will know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in a supportive learning environment. Candidates will support students in accessing the core curriculum.

EDTE 607 SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Candidates will understand issues of assessment, including cultural and linguistic bias, political, social, and psychological factors, IQ, special education testing, special populations in the inclusive classroom, and the needs of students who are gifted and talented.

EDTE 608 LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Candidates will use a variety of standards-based language proficiency instruments to study the identification, placement, and demonstration of language growth. Candidates will know and use a variety of classroom and performance assessment tools that are standards-based to inform their instruction.

EDTE 609 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Candidates will plan activities that provide support for students and their families, and work collaboratively to improve the learning environment. Candidates will serve as professional resources, advocate for students, and build partnerships with the community.

EDTE 610 CLINICAL PRACTICUM

Candidates will apply instructional techniques, research results, advances in the field, and public policy issues. Candidates will use this information to reflect upon and improve their instructional practices. Candidates will collaborate with, and serve as, a resource to all staff, including paraprofessionals, to improve student learning.

MAT Commission[rg1] on Teacher Credentialing

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) has chosen not to prescribe a specific academic curriculum for the teaching credential. Therefore, one of the most informative methods of evaluating the current curriculum is by comparing it with the curricula offered by the three institutions identified as Pepperdine's Peer (i.e., Loyola Marymount University and University of California, Santa Barbara) and Aspirational (i.e., University of Southern California) Institutions.

In general, Pepperdine curriculum aligns relatively well with the curricula offered by these institutions, with most of the classes offered in the TPP matching those offered in the peer and aspirational schools. In other ways, the TPP curriculum varies from comparison institutions.

First, UCSB offers a variety of 1 and 2 unit courses over 5 quarters and therefore offers a greater variety of courses than the other institutions, including Pepperdine. Second, two institutions offer separate courses in Teaching English Learners and in ELD/SDAIE methods and procedures.

Pepperdine offers all this content in one 3 (graduate pathway) or 4 (undergraduate pathway) unit

course entitled Teaching English Learners. Third, all three of the comparative institutions offer separate courses for each single subject content area. In contrast, Pepperdine's undergraduate pathway offers one 4-unit teaching and content area methods course for all candidates seeking a single subject credential that individualizes coursework to each candidate's content area. In the graduate pathway, single subject candidates take two 1-unit content-specific methods courses, though the course title is not subject specific. With the recent changes to the Title 5 section 80499 that requires individuals seeking an Added Authorization to complete a 3- unit subject specific pedagogy course, it has been decided that MATP 670 (Developing Secondary Methods) will be changed from 3 to 2 units, MATP 672 (Developing Content Area) will be changed from 1 to 2 units, MATP 674 (Advanced Secondary Methods) will be changed from 3 to 2 units, and MATP 676 (Advanced Content Area) will be changed from 1 to 2 units. By doing this, students will have a total of 4 units of Content Area methods instruction (2 units in MATP 672 and 2 units in 676). These changes have been submitted to UAC for approval.

TEACHER PREPARATION PATHWAY

CORE CURRICULUM

MATP 600	Human Development
MATP 610	Instructional Design
MATP 620	Literacy in the 21 st Century
MATP 630	Teaching English Learners

MULTIPLE SUBJECTS

MATP 660	History-Social Science/Visual Performing Arts
MATP 662	Science-Technology-Mathematics
MATP 664	Language Arts

SINGLE SUBJECT

MATP 670 Developing Secondary Methods

MATP 672 Developing Content Area

MATP 674 Advanced Secondary Methods

MATP 676 Advanced Content Area

PRAXIS

MATP 681 Clinical Experience 1

MATP 682 Clinical Experience 2

MATP 683 Clinical Experience 3

MATP 691 Design and Action Research 1

MATP 692 Design and Action Research 2

TEACHER PREPARATION PATHWAY

	Fall (Phase 1)	Spring (Phase 2)	Summer (Phase 3)
Cohort 1			
Fall Term	MATP 691: Action Research 1 (3 units) MATP 610: Instructional Design (4 units) MATP 620: Literacy (4 units) MATP 681: Clinical Experience 1 (1 unit) TOTAL UNITS= 12	MATP 600: Human Development (4 units) MATP 630: English Language Learners (3 units) MATP 682: Clinical Experience 2 (2units) Multiple Subject Candidates: MATP 662: STEM (3 units) Single Subject Candidates:	MATP 692: Action Research 2 (3 units) MATP 683: Clinical Experience 3 (2 units) Multiple Subject Candidates: MATP 664: Language Arts Methods (3 units) MATP 660: His/VPA Methods (2 units) Single Subject Candidates:

		<p>MATP 670: Dev. Sec Methods (2 units)</p> <p>MATP 672: Dev. Content Area (2units)</p> <p>TOTAL UNITS= 12 (MS) and 13 (SS)</p> <p>*PACT</p>	<p>MATP 674: Adv. Sec Methods (2 units)</p> <p>MATP 676: Adv. Content Areas (2 units)</p> <p>TOTAL UNITS= 10 (MS) and 9 (SS)</p>
	Spring (Phase 1)	Summer (Phase 2)	Fall (Phase 3)
Cohort 2 Spring Term	<p>MATP 691: Action Research 1 (3 units)</p> <p>MATP 610: Instructional Design (4 units)</p> <p>MATP 620: Literacy (4 units)</p> <p>MATP 681: Clinical Experience 1 (1 unit)</p> <p>TOTAL UNITS= 12</p>	<p>MATP 600: Human Development (4 units)</p> <p>MATP 630: English Language Learners (3 units)</p> <p>MATP 682: Clinical Experience 2 (2units)</p> <p>Multiple Subject Candidates:</p> <p>MATP 662: STEM (3 units)</p> <p>MATP 660: His/VPA Methods (2 units)</p> <p>Single Subject Candidates:</p> <p>MATP 670: Dev. Sec Methods (2 units)</p> <p>MATP 672: Dev. Content Area (2units)</p> <p>TOTAL UNITS= 14 (MS) and 13 (SS)</p>	<p>MATP 692: Action Research 2 (3 units)</p> <p>MATP 683: Clinical Experience 3 (2 units)</p> <p>Multiple Subject Candidates:</p> <p>MATP 664: Language Arts Methods (3 units)</p> <p>Single Subject Candidates:</p> <p>MATP 674: Adv. Sec Methods (2 units)</p> <p>MATP 676: Adv. Content Areas (2 units)</p> <p>TOTAL UNITS= 8 (MS) and 9 (SS)</p> <p>*PACT</p>
	Summer (Phase 1)	Fall (Phase 2)	Spring (Phase 3)

Cohort 3		MATP 691: Action Research 1 (3 units)	MATP 600: Human Development (4 units)	MATP 692: Action Research 2 (3 units)
	Summer Term	MATP 610: Instructional Design (4 units)	MATP 630: English Language Learners (3 units)	MATP 683: Clinical Experience 3 (2 units)
		MATP 620: Literacy (4 units)	MATP 682: Clinical Experience 2 (2units)	Multiple Subject Candidates:
		MATP 681: Clinical Experience 1 (1 unit)	Multiple Subject Candidates:	MATP 664: Language Arts Methods (3 units)
		Multiple Subject Candidates:	MATP 662: STEM (3 units)	Single Subject Candidates:
		MATP 660: His/VPA Methods (2 units)	Single Subject Candidates:	MATP 674: Adv. Sec Methods (2 units)
		TOTAL UNITS= 14 (MS) and 12 (SS)	MATP 670: Dev. Sec Methods (2 units)	MATP 676: Adv. Content Areas (2 units)
			MATP 672: Dev. Content Area (2units)	TOTAL UNITS= 8 (MS) and 9 (SS)
			TOTAL UNITS= 12 (MS) and 13 (SS)	*PACT

[rg1]This is MAT

6. How current is the program curriculum? How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?

Over a two year period, the Pepperdine Teacher Education faculty at Seaver and the GSEP met to redesign curriculum and develop a coordinated program with an offering of an undergraduate credential pathway and a MA /credential pathway. This unification was prompted by: (1) a mandate by the state accrediting agency, the California Commission on Teacher Credential (CCTC), that we function as one program, (2) an interest in pursuing national accreditation through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), formerly NCATE, which requires that we operate as one program, and (3) a request from the Provost to offer a more coordinated program. The new curriculum is a total of 34 units (a reduction from 47 units in the graduate pathway and from 35 (MS) and 36 (SS) in the undergraduate pathway) and has a greater emphasis on integration between the clinical experience and the course work theory to practice integration. The new curriculum was implemented in Fall 2012 at the graduate school and in Fall 2013 at Seaver due to differing SAC and UAC deadlines at Seaver and GSEP. Technology, diversity, and special populations were embedded in courses throughout the

program. It also placed the program in line with Pepperdine's peer institutions who offer the masters and credential for 30-32 units.

7. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) has chosen not to prescribe a specific academic curriculum for the teaching credential. Therefore, one of the most informative methods of evaluating the current curriculum is by comparing it with the curricula offered by the three institutions identified as Pepperdine's Peer (i.e., Loyola Marymount University and University of California, Santa Barbara) and Aspirational (i.e., University of Southern California) Institutions.

In general, Pepperdine curriculum aligns relatively well with the curricula offered by these institutions, with most of the classes offered in the TPP matching those offered in the peer and aspirational schools. In other ways, the TPP curriculum varies from comparison institutions. First, UCSB offers a variety of 1 and 2 unit courses over 5 quarters and therefore offers a greater variety of courses than the other institutions, including Pepperdine. Second, two institutions offer separate courses in Teaching English Learners and in ELD/SDAIE methods and procedures.

Pepperdine offers all this content in one 3 (graduate pathway) or 4 (undergraduate pathway) unit course entitled Teaching English Learners. Third, all three of the comparative institutions offer separate courses for each single subject content area. In contrast, Pepperdine's undergraduate pathway offers one 4-unit teaching and content area methods course for all candidates seeking a single subject credential that individualizes coursework to each candidate's content area. In the graduate pathway, single subject candidates take two 1-unit content-specific methods courses, though the course title is not subject specific. With the recent changes to the Title 5 section 80499 that requires individuals seeking an Added Authorization to complete a 3-unit subject specific pedagogy course, it has been decided that MATP 670 (Developing Secondary Methods) will be changed from 3 to 2 units, MATP 672 (Developing Content Area) will be changed from 1 to 2 units, MATP 674 (Advanced Secondary Methods) will be changed from 3 to 2 units, and MATP 676 (Advanced Content Area) will be changed from 1 to 2 units. By doing this, students will have a total of 4 units of Content Area methods instruction (2 units in MATP 672 and 2 units in 676). These changes have been submitted to UAC for approval.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

PEDAGOGY

8. Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).

Measures of Teaching Effectiveness

Data on program effectiveness is collected from multiple sources, analyzed and utilized to guide program improvement. Data sources informing program improvement include but are not limited to: course evaluations, Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey (currently graduate pathway only), Comprehensive Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation Programs, and Program Evaluation Surveys. The results of these data are provided to the faculty prior to a 1-day meeting, and discussion during the meeting identifies any recommended action steps for program improvement. An explanation of each of these data sources and their findings are reported below.

Course Evaluations: Student input is gathered through a variety of forms of regular evaluation.

Formal course evaluations of both the course content and the instructors are gathered at the end of each semester for all courses in both the undergraduate and the graduate programs. The course evaluation form has two main sections: questions related to The Course (e.g., “The course tests and evaluations are appropriate in content and difficulty” and “The course has increased my knowledge or understanding of the subject”) and questions related to The Professor (e.g., “The professor shows interest and enthusiasm for teaching the course” and “The professor presents course material in a clear and engaging manner”). Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale with options score 15 values given from 1 to 5 for (respectively) Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The form is scored in a manner that allows summary scores for each item, for The Course items, and for The Professor items. Student evaluations of professors are anonymous and confidential and are reviewed by the division chair at Seaver College or the Program Director and the Associate Dean at the Graduate School of Education and Psychology. They are then sent to the Deans to determine if any program/staffing adjustments need to be made. In addition, candidates evaluate each supervising teacher and each District Field Supervisor as part of the conclusion of their field experience and during exit interviews at the end of the program. Student evaluation data are anonymous. These data are reviewed by the appropriate faculty and program administrators and used to make appropriate program changes.

End-of- Program Survey: An End-of- Program Survey was designed last year in order to gain indirect evidence on the newly implemented program. For this reason, only data from last year’s survey administration is available. The survey is administered to all TPP completers and collects feedback on a variety of program components. Section 1 includes: (1) advising and support services, (2) admissions and financial aid, (3) campus climate, (4) instructional effectiveness, and (5) credential services. Section 2 includes program specific categories such as pedagogy, cultural/cognitive proficiency, assessment, reflection, professionalism, technology, and scholarly writing. Respondents score each item on a scale of 1 (inadequate), 2 (adequate), 3 (good), 4 (very good), and 5 (outstanding).

Candidates in the undergraduate pathway appear to be very satisfied with all aspects of the program. The graduate pathway responses are a reflection of the new program coursework that was launched in Fall, 2012, whereas the undergraduate responses refer to the old program coursework. (The undergraduate pathway launch began in Fall, 2013). As with any new program, there were adjustments required by both faculty and students. Specifically, the new program for the graduate pathways not only reflects the new coursework, but it is now taught in a blended format with 75% face-to-face sessions and 25% on-line. This change was a significant adjustment for candidates, who were accustomed to a 100% face-to-face format. In 3 areas, graduate candidates scored the areas in the 2-3 range, which reflects they considered the program adequate to good in preparation. Two areas received ratings of 3.3 which indicate that the 16 candidates felt these areas provided good preparation. Two areas were rated 4's. These areas of reflection and professionalism are key elements required for today's educators.

Candidates rated overall preparedness at a 3.3 for the graduate pathway. Undergraduates rated overall preparedness at a 4.8. It is important to note that due to the low number of responses in the graduate pathway, this data can only be used to draw initial conclusions. However, two sessions when candidates met with the Program Director and Director of Clinical Experience confirmed the overall rating.

Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey: The Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey is administered every two years to the graduate pathway graduates. The survey collects information from a sample of students in order to learn about student priorities and levels of satisfaction. Based on a 7-point scale, respondents rank 70 items on the level of importance for each survey item and then rank their level of satisfaction for the same item. Strengths and any resulting gaps between priorities and levels of satisfaction are identified. The survey items represent areas of overall satisfaction with university services, systems, and processes rather than specific curricular areas. However there are items that address levels of satisfaction with faculty knowledge and accessibility which is correlated with course evaluations to guide in faculty/course decisions. The indirect evidence gleaned from the results of the survey is used to inform the graduate pathway's improvement efforts. The 2012 graduate pathway survey data revealed that the areas with the smallest gaps between priority and satisfaction in the graduate pathway (indicating the program met their expectations) were in the areas of online academic services, printed information, physical safety, assistance in developing a degree plan, and innovation in teaching theories and practices. Areas with the largest gaps (indicating relative dissatisfaction) were in the areas of timely responses to student complaints, advising, options in program of study, readily available channels for student complaints, and return on financial investment.

Comprehensive Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation Programs: Pepperdine University contracts with the California Center for Teacher Quality (CCTQ) to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the professional teacher preparation program which compares Pepperdine graduates with graduates from eight other California Private Universities. This confidential report describes the professional preparation of the cohort of teacher candidates who finished their credential program during the prior academic year. Participants include public and private school teachers at all locations inside and outside of California, including individuals with year-long assignments and those serving as day-to-day substitute teachers. Specific areas of the report address descriptive information about the participants and their schools, evaluation of Teacher Education Program effectiveness for general and specific teaching practices, participant response to value of the program, and quality in relation to accreditation standards for credential programs. Each of these items is directly linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) identified by the State of California, which are further correlated to the PLOs for Pepperdine's TPP. The indirect evidence from these reports is reviewed by the Dean and disseminated to the appropriate parties for analysis. Results were referenced to inform planning of the new course structure. 17 Participants rate each item as either "Well or adequately prepared" or "Somewhat or not

prepared.” Analysis of the past few years has presented an overall pattern of employers rating first year Multiple Subject teachers a bit higher than the teachers rate themselves on most items. The reverse is seen for the Single Subject teachers. Small sample groups make it difficult to draw comprehensive conclusions. However, the trends have provided faculty with insight into curricular needs that can be modified to more fully address areas that are presenting a challenge for first year teachers.

Focus Group: A focus group with ten candidates from the graduate pathway met on February 27, 2014 to share feedback on their experiences mid-way through the academic year. Recommendations from candidates included a review of the course sequence and the unit allocation for methods courses. They proposed an earlier start for the Teaching English Learners course (first phase rather than second phase) and an increase in units for the History/VPA course (currently 2 units) in line with the STEM methods course (currently 3 units) for multiple-subjects candidates. Additionally, they felt that special educational needs, gifted and talented education, and the use of technology in teaching and learning should be embedded in all coursework, but especially methods courses.

Clinical Experiences Relevant to Program Goals.

Pepperdine TPP promotes positive, collaborative relationships with K-12 school districts in order to meet program goals and to maintain a high quality, teacher preparation program for undergraduate and graduate teaching candidates. There is a planned sequence of fieldwork for candidates throughout the teacher preparation program, structured in terms of three Clinical Experiences. This plan provides an early learning period, a decision making time for the student and for the faculty about that student’s possible success or failure, and finally a commitment to operate as a full-time credential candidate in a closely supervised student teaching situation. This provides for growth that is continual, reflective and substantive. Field experiences are aligned with coursework taken simultaneously. Students are encouraged to attend all staff development workshops, faculty meetings, student study team meetings, PTA meetings and committee meetings possible in order to continue their professional learning in the school setting. Available options for observation/participation fieldwork and /or student teaching are discussed in class, so far as is possible, with candidates and their professors. With the emphasis on preparing credential candidates to teach English Language Learners in a regular classroom setting, every effort is made to place credential candidates in appropriate school sites that will provide them this type of experience. Credential candidates’ placements and the work and experiences within these placements are planned collaboratively with the candidate, the Directors of Clinical Experience, who also provide and monitor field work placements, the University Field Supervisor, and the professor of the methods course or seminar taught on campus. Regular review of field placements is ongoing. It is done informally through conversation and regular meetings and formally through evaluation forms completed by University Field Supervisors and Master Teachers (results reported in “Student Learning” section below). As University Field Supervisors make their regular visitations and these are discussed with the Director of Clinical Experience, decisions are made to continue placements or change placements. Change of placements is rare, as sufficient care is taken to make optimum placements initially. Some restraints, however, are enforced by school districts insisting on district level school and teacher choices, and occasionally personality or professional problems make changes necessary. 18 Placements are formally reviewed after each placement period as credential candidates are rotated into new assignments. This is done through credential candidate and field supervisor evaluation forms and through informal discussions.

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Quality

Quality of the Degree: In meaning of the degree student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the quality of the program.

9. Describe the high impact practices which enrich the learning experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)

- a. Service learning**
- b. Research opportunities**
- c. Internships**
- d. Other high-impact practices**

Student Learning and Success -- Data on candidate and program completer performance is collected, analyzed and utilized to guide program improvement. Candidates are assessed for content knowledge and teaching performance abilities. Content knowledge is primarily assessed through the CATs (Content Area Tasks) as well as exams, including the CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test), CSET (California Subject Examination for Teachers), and the RICA (Reading Instruction Competence Assessment). Teaching performance abilities are assessed through each phase of candidate fieldwork with evaluations by Master Teachers, University Field Supervisors, and faculty. The summative assessment of pedagogical competence is the Performance Assessment for CATeachers (PACT) Teaching Event.

California Educator Credentialing Examinations: CBEST, CSET, RICA

The CCTC requires that multiple subject candidates pass: (1) all three subtests of the Multiple Subject CSET (California Subject Examination for Teachers), (2) the CSET Writing exam or the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) to fulfill their Basic Skills Requirement, and (3) the RICA (Reading Instruction Competence Assessment) which is a reading instruction competence assessment. Single Subject candidates must pass the CBEST and the CSET in the content area in which they are seeking their credential.

PACT (Performance Assessment for California Teachers) The CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) established a requirement that all candidates must pass a state-approved Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in order to be recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. Pepperdine's TPP adopted the PACT (Performance Assessment for CA Teachers) as its TPA and uses it as a key assessment tool to make critical decisions about candidate competence. PACT began as a consortium of teacher preparation programs at 30 universities, 1 district internship program, and 1 charter school network who joined together to develop a teacher performance assessment. It was enacted to ensure that regardless of the pathway (e.g., student teaching, district internships, university internships), teacher candidates in California meet a uniform set of standards. Among other provisions, it established a requirement for all California candidates for a preliminary teaching credential to pass a state-approved teaching performance assessment with demonstrated validity and reliability to supplement training, course assignments and supervisor evaluations. At Pepperdine, teacher candidates upload their PACT Teaching

Event on TaskStream, an electronic storage platform that provides a centralized information and communication hub for the TPP's assessment, accreditation, and planning activities. The PACT Teaching Event is scored by external assessors on TaskStream and consists of 5 tasks: (1) Context for learning, (2) Planning instruction and assessment, (3) Instructing students and supporting learning (documented in a video-tape of the teacher candidate's teaching), (4) Assessing student learning, and (5) Reflection on teaching and learning.

These five tasks are scored by a total of 12 rubrics which provide feedback for both teacher candidates and for programs. Teacher candidates are given a score of 1, 2, 3, or 4 (4 being the strongest) on each rubric with scores of 2 or above considered "passing." Taken together, the 2-3 rubrics within each scoring category provide feedback that is targeted at different constructs, providing a multi-dimensional picture of performance in each category and providing a complex picture of teacher candidate strengths and areas for growth as well as program strengths and targets for program improvement.

The fact that 95% of the teacher candidates that took the PACT last academic year passed on their

first try is direct evidence that Pepperdine TPP candidates are meeting state-mandated teaching performance expectations. It is also encouraging that mean scores on every rubric but two

increased from the 2011-2012 school year to the 2012-2013 one. Candidates were comfortable with designing rubrics and scoring student work, but requested more guidance in analyzing assessments at deeper levels. This is part of the PACT requirements. The faculty made adjustments in coursework to incorporate more discussions related to analyzing student work and how that guides future instruction. The course redesign also incorporated more reflective practice. This is another key component of the PACT event and student work samples taken from PACT events indicated many candidates were writing surface level reflections. Student reflections have improved on the whole and they are demonstrating more thoughtful practice.

The lowest score is on rubric 5 (PLOs #5, 6 and Task 3) which is "monitoring student learning during instruction." This skill is assessed by examining the teacher candidate's interaction with his/her students in the video clips and the degree to which s/he makes appropriate adjustments in instruction during the learning segment. Perhaps candidates need better instruction on what video

clips to submit to the external assessors that best capture how the candidates adjust instruction and respond to student questions, comments, and needs.

Supervisor Evaluations

Supervisor Evaluations from Master Teachers (MTs) and University Field Supervisors (UFSs)

provide beneficial direct evidence on teacher candidate development. MTs are in-service teachers that host teacher candidates in their classrooms, providing invaluable practical experience, support, instruction, and feedback. MTs assess teacher candidate performance by completing evaluations mid-way and at the end of the candidate's time in their classrooms.

University Field Supervisors are university employees who work cooperatively with the MT, the Director of Clinical Experience, and the school site personnel and support teacher candidates by observing, conferencing, providing constructive criticism, and assessing them throughout their placement. UFSs complete 4-6 evaluations of their assigned teacher candidates in each of their Clinical 2 and 3 experiences. Digital evaluation forms from the MTs and UFSs are gathered and housed on TaskStream. Supervisor evaluations are focused on five major areas of teacher candidate instruction related to the PLOs and TPEs as indicated below.

10. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?

- a. Academic and career advising programs and resources**
- b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants**
- c. Orientation and transition programs**
- d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.**
- e. Support for engagement in the campus community**
- f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success**
- g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities**
- h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity**
- i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures**
- j. the Sophomore Experience**
- k. Study Abroad**

The co-curricular experiences are rich and allow for students to apply what they are learning from their courses into their fieldwork experiences. Students also will use ethnography to capture their experiences and report their findings on case studies, observations, and individual work with K-12 students, and working with a master teacher in the education field. Additionally students are sharing a variety of experiences in courses, allowing them to discuss, analyze and reflect about their experiences working with K-12 students.

Professors from each course will continually refer to the learning in other courses to weave various concepts across courses and throughout the program. Courses are designed to be completed in unison to assist students in blending concepts and making material more accessible.

Diversity Outcomes

Although the PLOs assessed this year may not explicitly address the preparation of student for work with diverse populations, preparing students for this work is a fundamental tenet of GSEP's mission; hence, address how the analysis of data took this emphasis into account.

As a part of the SLO for MAED 600, Human Development, students were required to investigate contextual influences on development, including family, neighborhood, special needs, socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, culture, language an history. This assessment allowed students

to gain insights into the development and unique characteristics of people at a specific stage of development. This assignment further allowed candidates to differentiate approaches to the individual needs of people. As a result of the assessment, course readings, and course activities, students developed personal cultural proficiency vision stories.

Table 1

MAED 600 Signature Assessment	Directed Towards Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Met Expectations	Exemplified Expectations
	1	2	3	4
Cultural/Diversity Assignment	0	0	0	16/16

11. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.

As part of the final project for the Masters in Teaching Program, students are to present an Action Research Project, which is usually implemented at a K-12 school site. The students have the option of later publishing these projects and some do once they leave and graduate the program. Attached are several project examples.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

STUDENT SUCCESS, ALUMNI, AND ASSESSMENT DATA

Student success data

12. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program?

Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).

OIE provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site.

Student Success Data

Attached is the student success data for your program.

Enrollment_Data_Education_Division_Fall2010_15_all_MA_Education__Teaching__TESOL.xlsx

According to the Profile of Teachers in the U.S. 2011 published by the National Center for Educational Information, White teachers make up 84% of the teaching force in the US (down from 91% in 1986). Comparatively, 65% of Pepperdine's teacher candidates identify themselves as White, 10% identify themselves as Hispanic, 10% identify themselves as Asian, and 8% identify themselves as Black. A greater percentage of Pepperdine TPP teacher candidates identify themselves as non-White than the nation as a whole. The percentage of female students in the Pepperdine TPP (85%) mirrors that of the nation in which 84% of the teaching force is female (up from 69% in 1986). This is substantially higher than percentage of females at Pepperdine as a whole. As seen below, the gender make-up of the TPP has remained fairly stable over the past few years, with an increase in the percentage of male students in 2012-2013 academic year.

Student and Alumni Data

13. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.

Student and alumni survey data

Attached is the student and alumni survey data for your program.

Noel_Levitz_Data_Report__NL_GSEP__2015__04_28_15_rev1.pdf

See Noel Levitz data for additional student feedback.

Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey: The Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey is administered every two years to the graduate pathway graduates. The survey collects information from a sample of students in order to learn about student priorities and levels of satisfaction. Based on a 7-point scale, respondents rank 70 items on the level of importance for each survey item and then rank their level of satisfaction for the same item. Strengths and any resulting gaps between priorities and levels of satisfaction are identified.

Assessment Data

14. Other relevant data. e.g. General education data, special reports.

Assessment Data

Attached is the assessment data for your program.

No additional data provided at this time.

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Integrity

In meaning of the degree (section four) student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the rigor of the program.

15. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this? Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?

Although the report and included data reflect limited multimodal assessment and highlight areas of additional attention and support, annual assessment reports were completed for many Education Division program. Samples of data collection and evaluation processes are included within annual reports. See attached samples from each program. The QIP will address the specific changes necessary to improve programs' assessment practices.

Assessment Plan

For each PLO assessed this year, list the direct and indirect forms of evidence that were used in the assessment.

Note: Direct evidence arises from performance-based evaluations pertaining to MAT such as observation and student work samples. Indirect evidence arises from measures of perceived value such as surveys or questionnaires. Authentic evidence arises from measure of a student's ability to apply his or her learning and knowledge in real world applications.

	Direct Evidence	Indirect Evidence	Authentic Evidence
PLO #1	Cultural /Diversity Assignment	Teacher Candidate Dispositions Inventory	Clinical experience fieldwork, 681, 682 and 683.
PLO # 2	Cultural/Diversity Assignment		Clinical experience fieldwork, 681, 682 and 683.
PLO # 3	Cultural/ Diversity Assignment	Teacher Candidate Dispositions Inventory	Clinical experience fieldwork, 681, 682 and 683.

[rg1] would leave the matrix below if you wanted to include for MAT, and I have included additional requested information. But if you want it to speak to MAED, then I would remove the information included by me.

16. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning (survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.

Pertaining to MAE, students were assessed on their Cultural/Diversity assignment as a part of MAED 600. Students developed a research question for their cultural/diversity assignments and wrote an annotated bibliography of relevant sources for a theoretical framework for their study. Students were evaluated by their professor on their ability to satisfy these requirements. A rubric was developed and used to evaluate the cultural/diversity papers. All students were able to successfully complete this assignment in an exemplary manner.

Cultural/Diversity Rubric

	Exemplified Expectations	Met Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Directed Towards Expectations	Score
Criteria	4	3	2	1	
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least three comprehensive pieces of data included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least three pieces of data; data may be limited in scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than three pieces of data or data minimally comprehensive 	Data not comprehensive	
Research Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough exploration of all research questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fair exploration of research questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data help minimally to answer research questions 	Data not aligned with research questions	
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varied stakeholder engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some variation in stakeholder engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal variation in stakeholder engagement 	No variation in stakeholder engagement	

Triangulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data triangulated & matches thoughtful research design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data somewhat triangulated to match thoughtful design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal attempt to triangulate data 	No attempt to triangulate data	
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data legible & organized in an useful way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data mostly legible & mostly organized in an useful way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data with minimal organization 	No organization of data	

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

MAE_Annual_Review_2013_2014.docx

2012_13_Ann_Prog_Review__MAE__final_.docx

WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES

17. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies.

For the MAT, PACT and Action Research Projects are used and below are the findings for those PACT assessments. Further, for MAE, Action Research Projects are used and those are scored as individual assessment scores for each course.

Institutional Learning Outcomes	GSEP Outcome(s)	PLO #1	PLO #2	PLO #3
ILO#1 Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.		i.		
ILO#2 Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.		i.	i.	

ILO#3 Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.			i.	i.
ILO#4 Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.		i.	i.	
ILO#5 Respond to the call to serve others.		i.		
ILO#6 Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.		i.	i.	
ILO#7 Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.		i.	i.	
ILO#8 Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.		i.		i.
ILO#9 Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.				

For additional information, see attached.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

GSEP_Core_Competency_Information.pdf

SUSTAINABILITY: RESOURCES

18. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.

In order to demonstrate this each program should address

- a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and**
- b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.**
- c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)**

We are in the process of revising the doctoral and masters programs in the department into a large core with specific concentrations for each program. This will allow sharing resources across programs, having flexibility to maintain programs for the long-run by merging students from different programs into the same cohorts and allow us to meet the needs of the market by offering additional concentrations.

19. FACILITIES

Please describe the adequacy of

- a. Classroom space**
- b. Laboratories**
- c. Office space**
- d. Programming venues**
- e. Student study spaces**

There is ample space for all students. More detail is available from the Associate Dean's office as facilities issues vary from semester to semester.

FACULTY AND STAFF

20. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?

Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs) :

- a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees**
- b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)**
- c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff members**
- d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**
- e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff**

Specific information relating to current faculty members for this program is available through the Director of Student Success Office at GSEP.

A breakdown of faculty by academic rank for GSEP is listed below:

21. FACULTY/STAFF

Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?

- a. Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)**
- b. Diversity of faculty/staff**
- c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)**
- d. Student-faculty ratio**
- e. Faculty workload**
- f. Faculty review and evaluation processes**
- g. Mentoring processes**
- h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)**
- i. Sufficient time for research, program development**

See attached for detail on FY16 Faculty Adjunct data.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

FY16_Faculty_Adjunct_data__3_.xlsx

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

22. Financial Resources:

Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.

The operational budget has been sufficient to provide the best possible course offerings for students. Operational budgets can be obtained from the GSEP Finance Office, Spencer Hardman. See additional information in the attached document.

Evidence

Please attach evidence.

5yr_programs_revenues___expenses.pdf

EXTERNAL REVIEW

External Review Report

In summary please explain how, through the findings in the annual assessments, the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the educational experience that is supported through benchmarking. (Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar institutions, or national standards?)

I. GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The external review typically occurs after a program or department completes its self-study report, but the selection and invitation of external reviewers can occur during the self-study process to ensure the availability of the best reviewers. However, programs with concurrent accreditation (e.g., AACSB, APA, ABA) can use the visiting team for that discipline-specific accreditation as the external review. The report from the site visitors should be included in the final report. For an illustration of potential areas for the reviewers to consider, see Attachment below.

II. CHOOSING REVIEWERS

The size and composition of the review team can vary, depending on the size of the program under review. Usually, the team involves one or two people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, appropriate individuals should submit a list of names of possible reviewers. These reviewers should be external to the school/University. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and be familiar with campuses that are similar to Pepperdine University and the program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration and with program assessment. At least one of the reviewers should be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment in order to review and analyze the program's assessment processes and results. The Dean of each School will have the final approval of the external reviewer.

III. MATERIALS FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

At least 30 days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and appropriate additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team. An identical information package should be provided to appropriate members of the administrators overseeing the program. The reviewers should compile a report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations based on evidence. The attached External Review Report expectations outlines the guidelines for the external reviewers' site visit and report. Reviewers and Divisional Deans should also sign a consultant agreement. External Reviewers should also be given a schedule for their visit and a confirmation letter, and programs will submit a budget proposal for the site visit to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

IV. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION

- Curriculum
- Faculty
- Resources
- Viability

V. EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM VISIT AND REPORT

The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee

members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit.

The team is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee no later than 4 weeks after the visit. The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation, and program viability as well as suggestions for policy and resources. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend and travel expense reimbursement (to be determined by the department under review).

As soon as the program receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the appropriate individuals. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of program review, the findings and resulting decisions should be shared with all of the stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the relevant faculty members should review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, they may follow up with their appropriate administrative unit regarding resource allocation or other barriers involved in preventing successful implementation.

External Reviewer Report Expectations

Please find the link below for the "External Review Summary Sheet".
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Z835R7F>

External Reviewer Report Expectations

Please attach the completed form.

MAT_MAE_and_TESOL_External_Review_Summary_Memo.pdf
 External_Review_MAT_Program_Report_Pepperdine_Crawford_17.pdf
 Copy_of_GSEP_External_Review_Summary_Sheet__1__1_.xlsx

FORMS

1. UAC REPORT

Programs should submit to UAC:

- a. The major strengths and weaknesses identified in the Program Review's Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). Please identify and cite the evidence that supports your answer.
- b. A list of the program goals established for the next five years (please list in order of priority, the most important goal first). Please cite the evidence that supports your answer.

Other documentation available to the UAC:

1. Program Reviews: found on the OIE web site
2. QIP: Upon Request
3. External Reviewer's Report: Upon Request
4. MOU: Upon Request

The major strengths and weaknesses identified in the Program Review's Quality Improvement Plan (QIP).

A list of the program goals established for the next five years (please list in order of priority, the most important goal first). Please cite the evidence that supports your answer.

PSLO	Improvement Actions	Evidence	Timeline	Responsible Individual	Comments
1	We will provide a more detailed and focused introduction to this PSLO in the fall term in MAED 640	MAED 691, &692 Course Syllabi	Fall Term	691 Professor	
2	Provide more explicit attention to expectations and accountability for analysis and synthesis of research literature in MAED 691, +++++	MAED 691 and 692 Course Syllabi	Spring Term	691, 692 Professor	
3	Provide more explicit introduction to this PSLO in fall term in MAED 691, include as rubric criteria for MAED 640 assignments.	MAED 691 Course Syllabus	Fall Term	691, 692 Professor	

Appendix A

ED 608A Self-Assessment Seminar (2)

Action Research

Student name: _____

Reviewer name: _____

SLO: The students will conceive of a research question for their action research project and write an annotated bibliography of relevant sources for a theoretical framework for their study.

Rating Scale: U= Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, E = Exemplary

	U – Unsatisfactory	S = Satisfactory	E = Exemplary
I. Research Question	Research question is too broad and not appropriate for action research.	Research question is too broad or poorly written.	Research question is focused and appropriate to the field being explored.
II. Annotated Bibliography (8-10 sources).	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection do not follow the http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated Bibliography. The Annotations do not consistently follow APA format. Length of each annotation does not reflect the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Articles are not from peer-reviewed journals. Books and/or book chapters are not from scholarly sources.	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection do not consistently follow the http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated bibliography. The Annotations do not consistently follow APA format. Length of each annotation does not reflect the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Not all Articles are from peer-reviewed journals. Books and/or book chapters are not consistently from scholarly sources.	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection closely adhere to http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated bibliography. Annotations follow APA format. Length of each annotation reflects the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Articles are from peer-reviewed journals. Books and/or book chapters are from scholarly sources.
II A. Summary Section	Summary includes partial information about the study description: “who what where when and how of the research. It does not include some or all of the following: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of	Summary includes a superficial description of the “who what where when and how of the research. It may or may not include some or all of the following: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of data analysis and results.	Summary includes a detailed description of the “who what where when and how of the research. Including: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of data analysis and results.

	data analysis and results.		
II.B Assessment Section	Assessment includes a partial evaluation of the source that may or may not include the expertise of the authors, the depth of the data collection methods, the conclusions drawn from the data, the objectivity of the source, and the goal of the source.	Assessment includes a superficial evaluation of the source that includes the expertise of the authors, and/or the depth of the data collection methods, and/or the conclusions drawn from the data, and/or the objectivity of the source, and/or the goal of the source.	Assessment includes a detailed evaluation of the source including the expertise of the authors, the depth of the data collection methods, the conclusions drawn from the data, the objectivity of the source, and the goal of the source.
II. C Reflection Section	A partial description of how this source fits into your research. Few of the following questions are answered: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?	A superficial description of how this source fits into your research. Most of the following questions are answered: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?	A detailed description of how this source fits into your research. Answering all of the following questions: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?
III. Clarity of Writing	Surface errors disrupt the meaning of the paper and make it difficult to read AND/OR APA style is inconsistent or incorrect. The paper includes jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions, euphemisms and biased	The paper reads adequately. Problems with mechanics and grammar exist AND/OR APA style is inconsistent. The paper has a limited use of jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions, euphemisms and biased language.	The paper reads well. The paper is polished and grammatically error free. APA style is consistent and error free. The paper is free of jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions,

	language in each annotation.		euphemisms and biased language.
--	------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

Total Points = _____ Average Score = _____

Strengths:

2. Educational Effectiveness Report

Please find the link below for the "Educational Effectiveness Indicators".
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B6ufJTOgPx32Nm5tVmdnbWx1SDQ>

Educational Effectiveness Report

Please attach the completed form.

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY'S CREDIT HOUR POLICY

For all Pepperdine programs, including but not limited to the undergraduate, master's, juris doctor, and doctoral levels, for each credit hour (unit) granted, students must have successfully met the academic requirements with an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that reasonably approximates not less than:

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
2. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practice, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours..

The above policy is applicable to all courses offered, regardless of the mode of delivery and/or session length (e.g. full term-length, weekend mode, abbreviated term, face-to-face, hybrid, online, etc.).

Approved by the University Academic Council - May 2012

PROCEDURE FOR CHECKING CREDIT HOURS

Credit hours will be examined for compliance by Department, by School, and by the Registrar prior to the start of each term.

Official credit hour approval occurs via UAC during new program proposals, changes to programs, changes to courses, and during program review (via UAC and ASLC).

Exceptions such as Independent Studies and Internships are checked on an ongoing basis by faculty, Division Chair and/or Associate Dean, and Registrar.

3. University Credit Hours

Please find the link below for the "University Credit Hour Policy Example Table".
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B6ufJTOgPx32RXhFeXBzMS10Tm8>

University Credit Hour Policy Example Table.

Please attach the completed form.

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

For the Quality Improvement Plan, the program should extract from the "preliminary quality improvement goals and action plan" of the self-study (section A.III) as well as from both the external and internal review recommendations.

The following prompts may be helpful in considering your QIP:

1. Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
2. Are department/program outcomes aligned with the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)?
3. Is the level of program quality aligned with the school/University's acceptable level of program quality?
4. Is the level of program quality aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
5. Are program goals being achieved?
6. Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the established standard of achievement? What are you using for comparison/benchmarking?
7. How have the results of program review been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and student learning outcomes?
8. What was identified in the process of examining the institution's program review process that may require deeper reflection, changes, and/or restructuring? What will be done as a result? What resources will be required?
9. What have the reviewers learned as they carried out assessments of student learning? How have assessment protocols, faculty development, choices of instruments, or other aspects of assessment changed as a result?

Many of the changes that occur following program review are related to curricular adjustments that are, in essence, resource neutral. Program faculty or staff should make note of the ways that they used data to make decisions. Changes that are outside the control of the program or need additional support should be noted and reviewed by the dean in the final section, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

QIP Form

Please find the link below for the "QIP Form".

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6ufJTOgPx32M3JiNTM3bV9KNVk/view?usp=sharing>

Please attach the QIP form

Please attach the completed form.

Education_Division_QIP_May_2017.docx

Summary and Reflections

Areas for further growth relate to increasing the level of understanding of the theoretical frameworks in relation to research studies, improving synthesis of literature review, better understanding of differences and relationship between findings and conclusions, and a better alignment of findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The benchmarks used were data from one previous year. Based on the exemplified ranking of a majority of our students, we are confident that our students are prepared to work with diverse populations.

GSEP's Education Programs are committed to a learner-centered approach. Each program has a set of objectives that a student graduating from the program is expected to achieve. The knowledge and skills taught in the program might be introduced in some courses. In other courses, students are asked to apply knowledge by practicing skills and demonstrating their abilities. Within the program, the values and dispositional attributes important for individuals entering the profession are emphasized.

A. Preliminary QIP: Goals, Actions, and Plans Based on Initial Self-Study

PSLO	Improvement Actions	Evidence	Timeline	Responsible Individual	Comments
1	We will provide a more detailed and focused introduction to this PSLO in the fall term in MAED 640	MAED 691, &692 Course Syllabi	Fall Term	691 Professor	
2	Provide more explicit attention to expectations and accountability for analysis and synthesis of research literature in MAED 691, +++++	MAED 691 and 692 Course Syllabi	Spring Term	691, 692 Professor	
3	Provide more explicit introduction to this PSLO in fall term in MAED 691, include as rubric criteria for MAED 640 assignments.	MAED 691 Course Syllabus	Fall Term	691, 692 Professor	

Educational Effectiveness Indicator	What was found?	What programmatic changes might result based on what was found?
Action Research Project	Overall students were able to demonstrate exemplary ability to examine the role of faith, personal beliefs and values. They were also	-Begin earlier in the term to provide expectations or

	<p>able to be able to work effectively in a diverse society.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Engagement: Students continued to be engaged throughout the Action Research Process. Only 2 students seemed to struggle. In general, they remained consistent with building on their experiences which were reflected in their presentations.</p>	<p>final papers, reports and presentations</p> <p>-Refer students to the Writing Support center as needed and schedule writing workshops for groups in the spring and summer terms</p> <p>-clarify norms for Actions Research presentations each term.</p>
--	--	--

Appendix A

ED 608A Self-Assessment Seminar (2)

Action Research

Student name: _____ Reviewer name: _____

SLO: The students will conceive of a research question for their action research project and write an annotated bibliography of relevant sources for a theoretical framework for their study.

Rating Scale: U= Unsatisfactory, S = Satisfactory, E = Exemplary

	U – Unsatisfactory	S = Satisfactory	E = Exemplary
I. Research Question	Research question is too broad and not appropriate for action research.	Research question is too broad or poorly written.	Research question is focused and appropriate to the field being explored.
II. Annotated	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection do not	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection do not consistently follow the	For each article, book or book chapter the summary, assessment and reflection closely

Bibliography (8-10 sources).	<p>follow the http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated Bibliography. The Annotations do not consistently follow APA format. Length of each annotation does not reflect the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Articles are not from peer-reviewed journals.</p> <p>Books and/or book chapters are not from scholarly sources.</p>	<p>http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated bibliography. The Annotations do not consistently follow APA format. Length of each annotation does not reflect the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Not all Articles are from peer-reviewed journals.</p> <p>Books and/or book chapters are not consistently from scholarly sources.</p>	<p>adhere to http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/ standards for annotated bibliography. Annotations follow APA format. Length of each annotation reflects the length of the article that article, book or book chapter. Articles are from peer-reviewed journals. Books and/or book chapters are from scholarly sources.</p>
II A. Summary Section	<p>Summary includes partial information about the study description: “who what where when and how of the research. It does not include some or all of the following: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of data analysis and results.</p>	<p>Summary includes a superficial description of the “who what where when and how of the research. It may or may not include some or all of the following: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of data analysis and results.</p>	<p>Summary includes a detailed description of the “who what where when and how of the research. Including: demographic details about participants, context of the study, data collection methods, overview of data analysis and results.</p>
II.B Assessment Section	<p>Assessment includes a partial evaluation of the source that may or may not include the expertise of the authors, the depth of the data collection methods, the conclusions drawn from the data, the objectivity of the source, and the goal of the source.</p>	<p>Assessment includes a superficial evaluation of the source that includes the expertise of the authors, and/or the depth of the data collection methods, and/or the conclusions drawn from the data, and/or the objectivity of the source, and/or the goal of the source.</p>	<p>Assessment includes a detailed evaluation of the source including the expertise of the authors, the depth of the data collection methods, the conclusions drawn from the data, the objectivity of the source, and the goal of the source.</p>

II. C Reflec tion Sectio n	A partial description of how this source fits into your research. Few of the following questions are answered: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?	A superficial description of how this source fits into your research. Most of the following questions are answered: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?	A detailed description of how this source fits into your research. Answering all of the following questions: How was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic?
III. Clarity of Writin g	Surface errors disrupt the meaning of the paper and make it difficult to read AND/OR APA style is inconsistent or incorrect. The paper includes jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions, euphemisms and biased language in each annotation.	The paper reads adequately. Problems with mechanics and grammar exist AND/OR APA style is inconsistent. The paper has a limited use of jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions, euphemisms and biased language.	The paper reads well. The paper is polished and grammatically error free. APA style is consistent and error free. The paper is free of jargon, slang and idiomatic expressions, euphemisms and biased language.

Total Points = _____ Average Score = _____

Self-study reports conclude with a section devoted to future planning and improvements (action items). Findings from all prior sections of the report serve as evidence for the action item so to strengthen the program. This section should address goals for the next few years and how the program will achieve the goals through planning and evaluation. Consideration should be given to resource-neutral ways or re- allocation of resources for improving the program as well as a review of current internal resources and improvements that could only be addressed through additional resources.

This portion of the self-study report interprets the significance of the findings in the above analysis of program evidence. Its purpose is to determine a program's strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

Conclusions drawn in this section could answer some or all of the following questions:

- Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
- Are department/program outcomes aligned with the institutional learning outcomes (ILO's)?
- Is the level of program quality aligned with the school/University's acceptable level of program quality? Aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
- Are program goals being achieved?
- Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the established standard of achievement?
What are you using for comparison/benchmarking?

This section will serve as the foundation for the program's Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) after the external review and internal reviews have been completed.