

# Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2012-13

Subject Area Committee Name: **Education: Paraeducator**

Contact person: **Tanya Mead**

For LDC/DE: Core outcome(s) assessed: \_\_\_\_\_

For CTE: Degree or certificate\* assessed: **AAS in Paraeducation**

\*please attach a table showing the alignment of the degree or certificate outcomes with the College Core Outcomes

Please address the questions below and send to [learningassessment@pcc.edu](mailto:learningassessment@pcc.edu) by **June 21, 2013** with Annual Report in the subject line

*Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C Program Review Outline.*

1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from recent outcome assessments. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. Please be sure to **describe the connection** between the assessment results and the changes made.
  1. ***The main change that was implemented since our last program assessment was a change to the paper on the role of advocacy for educators in ED 100. ED 100 is a gateway class offered every term and taken by over one hundred students each year. Many of these students are not enrolled in our degree or certificate programs but are taking it as an elective out of interest. Advocacy is one of the state standards for paraeducators, and one of our program outcomes. Last year's SAC reviewed 76 papers using a trend analysis, and determined that "the quality of response varied a great deal and that the assignment could be improved in terms of soliciting more depth of understanding". The assignment was changed to a letter format where the students were required to write a letter on behalf of an actual or hypothetical person. A sample "authentic" letter written by a former student inspired the assignment and was used as the model. The letter was chosen because it accomplished greater depth. The committee felt that writing an actual letter would help students to take on the role of advocacy instead of just writing about it as they had in the prior assignment.***
  2. ***The portfolio remains a more comprehensive and significant assessment tool of our program, and this advocacy piece is one of fifteen different areas which are assessed as part of six outcomes. The portfolio, while providing more depth, is only required for certificate and degree completers each year (approximately 6-10). One of our prior goals was to get students to complete electronic portfolios and this was the first year we accomplished this. Five of the seven students completed an electronic portfolio using the Desire to Learn portfolio. Two of the students completed a hard-copy only while four students completed both hard copy and electronic versions.***

**For each outcome assessed this year:**

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:
  - The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).
  - The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?
  - Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report – OK to include in appendix). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.
  - How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another).
1. *The seven member SAC reviewed sixty-three ED 100 papers on advocacy as a SAC, performing once again a trend analysis to see what topics were covered, as well as to assess whether the change to the assignment delivered what we had hoped in terms of our outcomes rubric ( see attached rubric-outcome 2C). Reviewing the 63 papers from Fall and Winter terms provides us with a larger sample of student work, than is offered by the portfolio which is completed by 6-10 students each year. To ensure intergroup reliability on the rubric scoring scale, the group reviewed several papers as a large group to determine how to rate the papers using a 1-2-3 system that matches the rubric used by our program in the area of advocacy (see outcome 2C). Levels 2 and 3 are passing while level 1 is not.*
2. *Seven students completed the portfolio this year and the portfolios were reviewed by four faculty members of the Education SAC. Most portfolios were reviewed by at least three faculty members. Only one student initially passed out of the seven students. The rest were provided with feedback as to how to meet the outcome (s) sufficiently. Because the students have already made the changes in the electronic format, I am unable to show you what the portfolio looked like (that did not pass) but I can describe the specifics why particular students did not pass. Many of the students did not pass regarding outcome 4: "practice ethical and legal standards of conduct"; this section includes eight different items such as "mandatory abuse reporting law" for example. The students need to provide a school district handbook and indicate the location of the item in the handbook. The non-passing students provided the artifact in the form of a school district handout but neglected to indicate where to find the specific item. Another student did not pass Outcome 1A: "Using research based instruction to provide instructional support to diverse student populations". She was the only student this year who got confused about research-based instruction and wrote about a lesson where students had to do research as part of their learning. While an interesting lesson, this is not the intent of this outcome. The outcomes asks that paraeducator students are aware of proven "research-based" models of instruction such as scaffolding, modeling, ways of doing small group work, etc. The Portfolio instructor communicated with the paraeducator students and allowed them to make changes in order to pass this high-stakes portfolio; passing the portfolio earns the students the Paraeducator program certificate or degree.*

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?
  - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.
  - Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results.
  1. ***Advocacy papers: The majority of students 59/63 did not achieve a 2 or pass in terms of our rubric (see outcome 2C). The results proved beyond a doubt that our assignment change had not accomplished what it needed to. In fact, our assignment should have been based more precisely on the rubric upon which we are assessing students! (Mea culpa!) The results also showed the topics students are focused on are still all over the map and cover issues such as physical, abuse, substance abuse, disability, sexual orientation, mental health, self-esteem, cultural issues, domestic issues, poverty, and academic issues. The SAC agreed that the variety of topic is not the problem or source of concern. The problem is clearly that we have not designed an assignment that gives students a chance to achieve the knowledge and skills pertaining to advocacy that is suggested by our rubric. The main areas where students are not achieving the kind of advocacy they are supposed to is in terms of (1) "knowledge of federal, state and district policies and procedures" and (2) "accessing support programs to meet student needs". Otherwise, they meet in terms of "explaining the value of serving all children and youth in supportive, inclusive learning environments" and "protecting health, safety and well-being of all learners"***
  2. ***In terms of the portfolio, students are generally meeting the advocacy standard because they use the program rubric (see rubric, outcome 2C) to select their evidence and write their reflections. They are able to understand exactly what is needed in terms of advocacy because they are using the rubric to construct the portfolio in a 2-credit portfolio class. One the other hand, they also demonstrated they did not fully understand what was expected of them in terms of outcome 4: "practice ethical and legal standards of conduct".***
4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).
  1. ***The assignment of advocacy for ED 100 has to be redesigned once again. The committee and instructors agree that the content in the ED 100 needs to be updated and improved with a strong focus on federal, state and district policies as well as support programs to meet student need so that students are better able to meet the expectations of outcome 2C: Advocacy. The assignment needs to specifically address that students respond to these above underlined issues which are measured by the rubric. The current assignment does not offer the students a chance to meet this outcome satisfactorily. The SAC agreed that a case-study might work better to focus the students, and one that asks them to reflect on laws, ethical behavior and support services. Faculty agreed to spend some time ensuring this assignment allows students to successfully meet a level 2 or 3 on the rubric. This assignment will be offered starting in Fall 2013 and the SAC will assess these papers during the Spring SAC.***
  2. ***Outcome four needs to be better explained next year so that students better understand what is***

***expected of them. They need to review the school district booklet on codes of behaviors and respond to the eight issues mentioned under outcome 4 (see rubric).***

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

- 1. I think this process proved the usefulness of the assessment protocol. We thought we had redesigned the ED 100 advocacy paper appropriately and this process proved us wrong. "Depth" was not what the rubric required (and depth is frankly challenging to measure well- nor did we have a rubric to spell out this "depth"). We have to once again go back to the drawing board, look more closely at our rubric and expectations, and design the assignment accordingly. This truly proves the validity of having an assessment process, of making ourselves reflect on our outcomes and ensuring that we prepare students to meet the program outcomes. We will measure ED 100 papers again next year to ensure that in fact we have created an effective assignment and one that allows students to demonstrate competency in this area, per the expectations of the rubric (in particular "knowledge of federal, state and district policies and procedures" and "accessing support programs to meet student needs").***
- 2. The portfolio (while smaller in quantity) will continue to provide a holistic assessment of the program, both for the students and the faculty delivering the program. The portfolio instructor is aware of which areas need more clarification and instruction for next year's spring term course on creating the portfolio. Finally, the portfolio offers the Education faculty an opportunity to understand the fuller program beyond the one or two courses that they teach. During the Fall and Spring SAC meetings, they have a chance to dialogue about the program outcomes and how they can help students meet these outcomes. In this way, the rubric outlining the outcomes and the student portfolios serve as a guiding documents for assignments, content and instruction within the paraeducator certificate and degree coursework.***

## Oregon Paraeducator Certificate

### Outcome 1: Demonstrate appropriate strategies and techniques to provide instructional support to students of diverse populations November, 2007

	<b>Using Research</b> Does the candidate use research-based techniques to support instruction?	<b>Individual instruction</b> Does the candidate modify instruction to meet individual student needs?	<b>Small Groups</b> Does the candidate adapt small group instruction to include nontraditional learners?	<b>Assessment</b> Does the candidate demonstrate the ability to administer student assessments as directed?
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Executes an engaging lesson including research-based techniques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Modifies instruction to assist a student with diverse/special needs in meeting all or most learning objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identifies &amp; practices a variety of teaching strategies to include diverse/special needs students in small group learning activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After adequate training, correctly administers a student assessment with no significant errors</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Executes a standard lesson using research-based techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Modifies instruction to assist a student with diverse/special needs in meeting some learning objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identifies &amp; practices basic teaching strategies to include diverse/special needs students in small group learning activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After adequate training, correctly administers a student assessment with few errors</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not incorporate or inappropriately applies research-based techniques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Modifies instruction to assist a student with diverse/special needs in meeting few learning objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited identification &amp; practice of teaching strategies to include diverse/special needs students in small groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After adequate training, cannot administer a student assessment without significant errors</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No attempt made to incorporate research-based techniques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not modify instruction when needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No attempt made to identify or practice teaching strategies to include diverse/special needs students in small groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unable to correctly administer a student assessment</li> </ul>

3 = Exemplary 2 = Meets standard 1 = Developing 0 = Unacceptable

To meet the standard, the candidate must earn a score of "2" or higher in each dimension of the scoring guide.

## Oregon Paraeducator Certificate

### Outcome 2: Demonstrate attitudes and behaviors that are appropriate in meeting the needs of diverse populations November, 2007

	<b>Teaching/Pedagogy</b> Does the candidate create an environment of acceptance and inclusion of all students?	<b>Competence in Serving Diverse Populations</b> Does the candidate demonstrate competence and sensitivity in regard to individuals' cultural, social, cognitive, and emotional differences?	<b>Advocacy</b> Does the candidate advocate for the rights of all students?
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Always models inclusive behaviors;</li> <li>▪ Builds on home and community experience to advance concepts</li> <li>▪ Interacts with students in ways that respect communication styles and differences</li> <li>▪ Uses names and includes all students in discussions</li> <li>▪ Allows and validates all points of view</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Articulates typical cultural, social, cognitive, and emotional challenges faced by students with special needs</li> <li>▪ Can identify appropriate professional responses to most situations in which students' cultural, social, cognitive, or emotional needs impact school success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Applies knowledge of federal, state, and district policies and procedures for:</li> <li>▪ Protecting health, safety and well-being of all learners</li> <li>▪ Accessing support programs to meet student needs</li> <li>▪ Explains the value of serving all children and youth in supportive, inclusive learning environments.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Usually models inclusive behaviors listed above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identifies typical cultural, social, cognitive, and emotional challenges faced by students with special needs</li> <li>▪ Can identify appropriate professional responses to limited types of situations in which students' cultural, social, cognitive, or emotional needs impact school success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates knowledge of federal, state, and district policies and procedures listed above</li> <li>▪ Explains the value of serving all children and youth in supportive, inclusive learning environments</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rarely models inclusive behaviors listed above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cannot identify most cultural, social, cognitive, and emotional challenges faced by students with special needs</li> <li>▪ Fails to consistently identify appropriate professional responses to situations in which students' cultural, social, cognitive, or emotional needs impact school success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates limited knowledge of federal, state, and district policies and procedures</li> <li>▪ Inadequately explains the value of serving all children and youth</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No observable attempt made to model inclusive behaviors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No attempt to identify cultural, social, cognitive, and emotional challenges faced by students with special needs</li> <li>▪ Is not able to identify appropriate professional responses to situations in which students' cultural, social, cognitive, or emotional needs impact school success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates no knowledge of federal, state, and district policies and procedures</li> <li>▪ Cannot explain the value of serving all children and youth</li> </ul>

3 = Exemplary 2 = Meets Standard 1 = Developing 0 = Unacceptable

To meet the standard, the candidate must earn a score of "2" or higher in each dimension of the scoring guide.

## Oregon Paraeducator Certificate

### Outcome 3: Apply best practices in classroom management to optimize the potential for student learning November, 2007

	<b>Relationships</b>	<b>Environment</b>	<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Intervention</b>
	Does the candidate understand the significance of adult-to-student and student-to-student relationships in the classroom?	Is the candidate able to develop and use procedures that enhance the academic and social effectiveness of the classroom?	Can the candidate enhance behavior management through instruction?	Is the candidate able to respond to student behavior in classroom and other contexts?
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engages with students actively and consistently</li> <li>▪ Interactions are developmentally appropriate and characterized by warmth, concern, and respect</li> <li>▪ Fosters healthy peer-to-peer interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develops and consistently uses systems and methods to support the work of the classroom</li> <li>▪ Works consistently within the existing behavior management framework of the classroom and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers and adapts instruction that engages all students and leads to success</li> <li>▪ Anticipates potential challenges to modify and adapt instruction as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistently takes into account student needs, classroom norms, and context in responding to student behavior</li> <li>▪ Evaluates the success of an intervention and makes appropriate adjustments or corrections</li> <li>▪ Avoids personalizing student misbehavior</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Actively engages with students, but may not do so consistently</li> <li>▪ Interactions are generally appropriate and characterized by warmth, concern and respect</li> <li>▪ Takes advantage of some opportunities to foster healthy peer-to-peer interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develops and generally uses systems and methods that generally support the work of the classroom</li> <li>▪ Generally works within the existing behavior management framework of the classroom and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers and adapts instruction that engages and leads to success for most students</li> <li>▪ Though some challenges were unanticipated, instruction is modified and adapted as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Takes into account student needs, classroom norms and context in responding to student behavior, but may not do so consistently</li> <li>▪ Sometimes evaluates the success of an intervention and makes appropriate adjustments or corrections</li> <li>▪ May occasionally personalize student misbehavior</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates hesitancy to engage with K-12 students</li> <li>▪ Interactions may be marginally appropriate or characterized by either excessive familiarity or distance</li> <li>▪ Makes little or no effort to foster healthy peer-to-peer interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uses methods that do not support the work of the classroom</li> <li>▪ Fails to consider the management framework of the classroom and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers and adapts instruction that engages and leads to success for a minority of students in the classroom</li> <li>▪ Unanticipated challenges seriously affect the outcome of the lesson</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fails to consider student needs, classroom norms and context in responding to student behavior</li> <li>▪ Reflection concerning classroom management practices does not lead to a change in behavior</li> <li>▪ Frequently personalizes student behavior</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates unwillingness to engage with K-12 students</li> <li>▪ Interactions are developmentally inappropriate and characterized by lack of interest, disdain or disrespect</li> <li>▪ Fosters negative peer-to-peer interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uses methods that undermine the work of the classroom</li> <li>▪ Ignores or is in conflict with the behavior management framework of the classroom and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers instruction that fails to engage or lead to success; does not adapt instruction as needed</li> <li>▪ Problems arise during instruction that should have been foreseen, and no learning takes place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does not respond to inappropriate student behavior when a response is necessary</li> <li>▪ Does not engage in reflection concerning classroom management practices</li> <li>▪ Responds personally to student behavior issues</li> </ul>

3 = Exemplary 2 = Meets Standard 1 = Developing 0 = Unacceptable

To meet the standard, the candidate must earn a score of "2" or higher in each dimension of the scoring guide.

**Oregon Paraeducator Certificate**  
**Outcome 4: Practice ethical and legal standards of conduct.**  
**November, 2007**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of:	Completed?	Evidence
• Local school district code of conduct		
• Oregon statutes and rules addressing educator ethics		
• Mandatory abuse reporting law		
• Confidentiality and sharing of student information		
• Supervision requirements in public school settings		
• Limits to personal expression in work environment		
• Scope of practice for paraeducator		
• Allowable uses of school equipment and technology		

To meet the standard, the candidate must demonstrate awareness of all areas listed above.

**Oregon Paraeducator Certificate**  
**Outcome 5: Apply technology to support teaching, learning and communication**  
**November, 2007**

	<b>Skills and Proficiencies</b>	<b>Application</b>
	Does the candidate have technological skills appropriate to school contexts?	Does the candidate use technology to support teaching, learning, and communication?
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a working knowledge of communication, word processing, database, and presentation/publishing programs as appropriate to school contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes extensive and appropriate use of technology with little or no assistance to support communication, teaching, and learning</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a basic knowledge of communication, word processing, database, and presentation/publishing programs as appropriate to school contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes adequate and appropriate use of technology with some assistance to support communication, teaching, and learning</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates little or no knowledge of communication, word processing, database, and presentation/publishing programs as appropriate to school contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes limited use of technology/requires major assistance in use of technology to support communication, teaching and learning</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids technology</li> <li>• Unable to use technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unwilling to support teaching, learning and communication with technology</li> <li>• Uses technology inappropriately</li> </ul>

3 = Exemplary    2 = Meets Standard    1 = Developing    0 = Unacceptable

To meet the standard, the candidate must earn a score of “2” or higher in each dimension of the scoring guide.

**Oregon Paraeducator Certificate**  
**Outcome 6: Meet NCLB academic standards for paraeducators.**  
**November, 2007**

- Demonstrate reading and writing competency at college level (passed or tested out of RD 115 and WR 115)
- Demonstrate math competency at introductory algebra level (passed or tested out of MTH 60)