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**Mission Statement**

The Mission of the College of Education at CSUSB is to prepare education and human service professionals for lives of leadership, service, and continual growth through the development of curriculum and programs that transform individuals and the community.

Our core beliefs in

* the dignity and inherent worth of all people,
* diversity and multiple perspectives as essential, treasured assets,
* a collaborative teaching/learning community,
* the crucial leadership role of education professionals in promoting positive social change fostering human development, achieving social justice, and promoting human rights

form the foundation for our work. In collaboration with university and P- colleagues, clients, students, alumni and the community-at-large, we apply our values and beliefs in responding to evolving needs and priorities in the schools, agencies and communities of the region we serve.

(College of Education *Conceptual Framework,* 2006)

**Catalog** **Description**

EDUC 738: Assessment and Evaluation – Assessment of student learning outcomes, tests, and measurements, measurement theory and using data for improvement. Four hours lecture and two hours practicum.

**Overview**

This course addresses assessment both, from a classical and from a modern perspective. Measurement is an integral part of assessment. Issues of validity, reliability and other characteristics of assessment results are addressed. Evaluation models and approaches are addressed from a variety of theoretical perspectives. Methods of evaluation are subsumed under the different theoretical perspectives.

**Course Goals**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Students who successfully complete this course will demonstrate an understanding of assessment principles and practices to measure, evaluate, and increase student achievement. To this end students will demonstrate the following: | |
|  | 1. Know competing views regarding the impact of high stakes assessment on students, teachers, educational institutions, and the community at large. 2. Know the processes that generate accountability measures for schools. 3. Know how to interpret the accountability reports schools and school districts receive from the California Department of Education (CDE). 4. Understand the relevance of various theories and principles of assessment. 5. Understand and distinguish between the concepts of reliability and validity. 6. Know the differences between norm and criterion referenced assessments and how data from these two types of assessment produce different types of score interpretations. 7. Distinguish between formative and summative assessments and know how to implement each. 8. Know how to judge the validity of assessment interpretations. 9. Be able to interpret item characteristics such as the reliability of scores, item difficulty, items discrimination, and standard error of measurement. 10. Gain an understanding about commonly used ‘standard setting’ procedures. 11. Demonstrate a working knowledge of modern assessment methods for obtaining objective measurements. 12. Know potential sources for bias that impact the quality of assessment results. 13. Know how to make accommodations for ELs and students with disabilities. 14. Know the trends in the use of technology in assessment and evaluation. 15. Develop an understanding of program evaluation models and apply them in educational settings. 16. Knowledge of the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (i.e., Classroom Assessment Standards; Program Evaluation Standards, and Personnel Standards in particular.) |

Course Objectives

Knowledge/Skills: Using specific learning objectives listed above, students will:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of California assessment programs and how these impact curriculum thinking and planning.
2. Analyze how educational institutions currently bring together curriculum, instructional practices and assessments to meet state and federal accountability demands.
3. Develop plans for enhancing student achievement, using data analysis, curriculum theory, and research-based instructional practice.
4. Define measurement.
5. Compare classical and modern test theories.
6. Define validity and reliability.
7. Compute and interpret reliability coefficients, item difficulty, item discrimination, and standard error of measurement.
8. Establish standard setting procedures that could be used within an educational system.
9. Describe state and federal laws that enable ELs and students with disabilities to be assessed in meaningful ways.
10. Use the Rasch simple logistic model to examine assessment data in order to evaluate the item and test characteristics.
11. Compare models of program evaluation.
12. Plan and design an evaluation of an educational program or curriculum.

Dispositions:

1. Demonstrate sensitivity to diversity in the discussion of problems and issues related to assessment and evaluation in education.
2. Demonstrate an ethic of caring in the discussion of problems and issues related to assessment in education.
3. Apply a framework for ethical decision making in issues pertaining to assessment in educational settings.
4. Establish specific ethical criteria for the evaluation of assessments and the procedures that guide the implementation of the state adopted academic standards (e.g., Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards).

Performance: Using knowledge of principles of research,

1. Critically evaluate existing instructional and intervention programs and practices.
2. Critically evaluate claims for raising student achievement.
3. Synthesize performance data, curriculum theory, learning research, and evaluate curriculum programs.
4. Develop plans to evaluate an educational program, materials and or intervention strategies aimed at improving student performance.
5. Use Rasch measurement theory and software to analyze a set of test data and critically examine the findings in light of existing local practices for testing students.
6. Make recommendations for improving formative assessment at an institution for learning.

### Course Assignments

1. Analysis of assessment data (40)

It is hoped that students will use existing student test data (or survey data) in this assignment. The better you know your data and the items that generated them the more meaningful will be your analyses. You will need to obtain a set of test scores or survey responses from 30 or more test takers will be ideal. Test data may be based on items that are multiple-choice items, partial credit items, or mixed format items. You will learn how to use Microsoft Excel and Winsteps software programs (Linacre 2011) for such analyzes. Details of the assignment will be provided in class.

The following is an outline of a report you are to submit for grading

1. *Description of the context of the assessment. Briefly describe the curriculum/content that was the focus of the assessment, the purpose of the assessment, and the general proficiency of the test takers*. *(4 points)*
2. *Computation of the following test characteristics: Mean, median, and mode(s) of person scores; range and standard deviation;* Item difficulty and *item discrimination; and Reliability coefficient and Standard Error of Measurement (SEM).*
3. *Interpretation of the results of (b). ( b and c 12 points)*
4. *A “Table of Specification” that lists the content standards or objectives and the cognitive demands of the items on the test. (4 points)*
5. *Your professional judgment and conclusions as a result of your analyses of the assessment instrument in terms of how well the items support content, substantive, and structural validity. (5 points)*
6. *Report of the analyses using Winsteps software. Examine the output tables to determine how well the data support validity. Report your findings. Include tables to support your conclusions and interpretations. (15 points)*

**Please email the instructor an electronic copy of the data before the 4th week of classes (i.e., before July 19, 2014).**

**Submit data, Winsteps specification files, and all other analyses/tables before the last class session (August 30).**

1. Readings, followed by online and classroom discussion (30 Points)

Textbook and article reading assignments are made on a weekly basis along with prompts for you to discuss. The readings address various theories, principles, and approaches for conducting and understanding assessments and evaluations. They also address the laws, practices, and successes of the accountability movement including debates in the public arena about accountability and assessment in general. The readings are from the course textbooks and from a list of articles and reports. The students will put themselves into teams of three or four to respond to prompts that will enhance discussions. Students are to post their discussion in Blackboard’s discussion platform. Each week one member will summarize the views of the group.   
The list of readings can be found in blackboard and below in the course agenda.

1. Evaluation of Program (30 Points)

Identify an educational program in your field that warrants an evaluation. Develop a detailed evaluation proposal for the program. The proposal should include

(a) details of the program that is to be evaluated (1-2 pages),

(b) relevant literature regarding the intervention/program/field (1-2 pages),

(c) the evaluation approach and a justification for why this is a useful approach (1-2 pages), and

(d) a plan for conducting the evaluation that includes (i) components of the program that are to be evaluated (1-2 pages), (ii) evaluation goals and objectives (1-page) (iii) data collection methods (1-3 pages), (iv) data analyses methods (1-3 pages).

Include a description of at least two instruments that will be used in the program evaluation process.

The proposal should range between 15 and 20 double-spaced pages. Further instructions will be provided in class.

1. Presentation (20 Points)

Conduct a 15-minute whole class presentation from one of the sections A, B, or C listed below. Please have your topic approved by the instructor by the 5th week of the quarter:

1. Report your findings from of the data analysis done for Assignment I.

Identify an audience to whom you are making the presentation. For example, you might make a presentation to the school board or to a group of teachers. If you are analyzing survey might make the presentation to fellow researchers who are interested in the measurement attributes of the instrument used for collecting the data.

1. Present your Evaluation plan from Assignment III to a specific audience such as a school board or a funding agency.
2. Interview at least two individuals who play a central role in the design, development and implementation of the School District mandated assessments.   
   Ask for alternatives if you do not work in a school district.

In the interview identify at a minimum:

1. Describe the characteristics of the assessments (i.e., type of assessment, format, curriculum scope, etc.)
2. How many assessments are scheduled across the year for the different grade levels and subject areas for which the assessments are administered in the school district?
3. Who is/was involved in the selection and /or construction of the items that make up the assessments?
4. What process was used in the construction of the assessments?
5. How many forms of the assessment exist?
6. What training or guidance was provided to individuals involved in the development of the assessments?
7. Data management:
   1. How are student responses to the assessments scored, analyzed and reported to (a) grade level teachers, (b) students, (c) parents and (d) other stakeholders?
   2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the data management system the school district uses to manage assessment data?
8. What is the level of training given to the teachers so they can access the data and make appropriate decisions for instructional purposes?
9. What recommendations are given teachers regarding the curriculum and instructional plans to improve student performance in areas of weakness based on student performance?
10. What suggestions do you have for the school district based on your findings from the analysis you conducted on student data?
11. A presentation dealing with (a) assessment and research related issues facing K-12 education and (b) evaluation of school programs. **Please note that you are not to make a presentation of content you have already made in another course**. You are expected to plan and develop a presentation that is consistent with the purposes of this course i.e., that focuses on educational assessment and evaluation.

Possible topics include:

1. Ongoing plans to implement the Smarter Balanced Assessment System.
2. Correlation studies of district tests scores to achievement on the CSTs. Include research behind any school district developed testing program.
3. Evaluate the validity and reliability of your school district’s benchmark tests relative to the CSTs.
4. Issues of ‘Closing’ the Achievement Gap.
5. Evaluation of a successful program that claims to have assisted in closing the achievement gap.
6. Critique/evaluate theorists or researchers such as Kozol, Rand Corp. Darling-Hammond, Katy Haycock, Fordham Institute, etc.
7. Review of results from the 'What Works' website at US Dept of Ed (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/> )
8. The Debate over Accountability and Validity of Multiple Choice Testing as the one measure of school success.
9. The Debate over Closing the Achievement Gap--2 opposing pieces of research on this site.
10. Describe a study (i.e., model, design, strategies, etc.) at a school or district that claims to have made major inroads in closing the achievement gap in some way and isolate those factors that play a significant role; include a discussion of the assessment component used to make those claims.

**Required Textbooks**

# Ryan, K., & Shepard, L. A. (2008). *The future of test-based educational accountability.* New York: Routledge.

# Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J., & Worthen, B. (2010). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*.  Boston: Pearson.

**Recommended Textbooks**

# Bond, T. and Fox, C. (2007). Applying the Rasch Model: Fundamental Measurement in the Human Sciences. Lawrence Erlbaum.

# Koretz, D. (2008). *Measuring up: what education testing really tells us*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Journal Article Readings**

*Please select one reading from each section. Articles with asterisks are required reading. A few additional readings may be assigned as they become relevant to the discussions in the course.*

**Accountability** *(Week 2)*

## California Legislative Information (2013). AB-484 Pupil assessments: Measurement of Academic Performance and Progress (MAPP). Retrieved from

<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB484> \*

California Department of Education (2014). Smarter Balanced Assessment System. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/index.asp>

Fuller, B., Wright, J., Gesicki, K., Kang, E. (2007). Gauging Growth: How to Judge No Child Left Behind? Educational Researcher, 36 (*5*), 268-278.

Linn, Robert L. (2000). Assessment and accountability. *Educational Researcher,* 29 *(2),* 4-16*.*Also available in short form at: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=11>

Linn, Robert L., Baker, Eva L., & Betebenner, Damian W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.  *Educational Researcher,* 31 (*6*), 3-16.

National Research Council and National Academy of Education. (2010). *Getting Value Out of Value-Added: Report of a Workshop.* Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Educational Accountability, Henry Braun, Naomi Chudowsky, and Judith Koenig, Editors. Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

**Reliability** *(Week 3)*

Frisbie, David A. (1988). Reliability of scores from teacher-made tests*. Educational Measurement, 7*, 25-35. \*

Frisbie, D. A. (2005). Measurement 101: Some Fundamentals Revisited. *Educational Measurement,* 24*(3)*, 21-8.

Kline, P. (1993). Reliability of tests: Practical issues. In Ch 1, *The Handbook of Psychological Testing*, 5-15.

Traub, Ross E.; Rowley, Glenn L., (Spring, 1991). Understanding reliability. *Educational Measurement.* 10, 37-45. \*

**Validity** *(Week 4)*

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G.J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review*, *11*, 1061-1071.\*

Haertel Edward H. (1999). Validity Arguments for High-stakes Testing: In Search of the Evidence. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 18(*4),* 5-9. \* **5**

Haladyna, T. M.; Downing, S. M. (2004). Construct-irrelevant variance in high-stakes testing. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 23(1), 17-27.*

Lane, Suzanne. (2004). Validity of High-Stakes Assessment: Are Students Engaged in Complex Thinking? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 23 (3), 6-14.*

Mehrens, W. A. (1997). The consequences of consequential validity. *Educational Measurement, 16(2)*, 16-18.

Messick, Samuel. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*. 50(9), 741-749. \* **5**

Mislevy, Robert, J. (2007). Validity by Design. *Educational Researcher*, 36(8), 463-469.

**Formative Assessment** *(Week 5)*

Black, Paul, Harrison, Christine, Lee, Clare, Marshall, Bethan, Wiliam, Dylan. (2004). Working inside the black box: assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86 (1)*, 8-21.

Black, Paul, Wiliam, Dylan. (1998). Inside the black box: raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80(2), 139-148.*

**Standard Setting** *(Week 6)*

Cizek, Gregory J., Bunch, Michael B., Koons Heather. (2004). Setting Performance Standards: Contemporary Methods. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice,* 23*(4),* 31-31*.*

Cizek, Gregory J. (1996). Standard-Setting Guidelines. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *15(1),* 13-21. \* **7**

Resnick, Lauren B, Rothman, Robert, Slattery, Jean B, Vranek, Jennifer L. (2003/2004). Benchmarking and alignment of standards and testing. *Educational Assessment,* 9 *(1/2),* 1-27*.*

**Assessing ELLs** *(Week 7)*

Kieffer, M.J., Lesaux, N.K., Rivera, M., & Francis, D.J. (2009). Accommodations for English language learners on large-scale assessments: A meta-analysis on effectiveness and validity. Review of Educational Research, 79,1168–1201.\*

Wolf, M. K., Herman, J. L., & Dietel, R. (2010). Improving the Validity of English Language Learner Assessment Systems: Full policy brief. (CRESST Policy Brief 10). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Abedi, Jamal. (2008). Classification system for English language learners: Issues and recommendations. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 33(1),* 4-14. \*8

Fairbairn, Shelley B, Fox, Janna. (2009). Inclusive Achievement Testing for Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Test Takers: Essential Considerations for Test Developers and Decision Makers. *Educational Measurement: Issues & Practice, 28(1), 10-24.\** **6**

**Assessing Students With Disabilities** *(Week 8)*

Fuchs, Lynn S., Fuchs, Douglas, & Capizzi, Andrea M. (2005). Identifying appropriate test accommodations for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 37(6),* 1-8.

Koretz, Daniel M., Barton, Karen. (2003). Assessing students with disabilities: Issues and evidence. *Educational Assessment, 9 (1&2)*, 29-60.

**Automated Assessments** *(Week 9)*

Quellmalz, Edys S.; Pellegrino, James W. (January 2, 2009). Technology and Testing. *Science*, *323*, 75-9.

Williamson, D. M. et al. (2010).Automated Scoring for the Assessment of Common Core Standards. http://www.ets.org/s/commonassessments/pdf/AutomatedScoringAssessCommonCoreStandards.pdf

**Standardized Testing**

Koretz, Daniel (2006). Steps Toward More Effective Implementation of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice,* 25*(3),* 46-50*.*

Mehrens, William A, Kaminski, John. (1989). Methods for improving standardized test scores: fruitful, fruitless, or fraudulent? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 8 (1), 14-22.*

*A supplementary list of books, articles, etc. will be provided in class as a handout.*

**Web sites of special note**

Visit :

<http://www.cde.ca.gov>,

* For API and AYP state, county, district, school API and AYP reports.
* For CST and Exit Exam test score summary results.
* For current information about California and national accountability rules and procedures

<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/>

“The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced) is a state-led consortium working to develop next-generation assessments that accurately measure student progress toward college- and career-readiness. Smarter Balanced is one of two multistate consortia awarded funding from the U.S. Department of Education in 2010 to develop an assessment system aligned to the[*Common Core State Standards (CCSS)*](http://www.corestandards.org/)by the 2014-15 school year.”

<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/smarter-balanced-assessments/technology/>

Technology Requirements

<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/pilot-test/>

Pilot test

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sa/practicetest.asp>

Take a practice test

<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/sample-items-and-performance-tasks/>

Sample items.

<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>

To access information about the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NCES houses NAEP the largest nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas.

<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG589/>

This Rand research study examines the impact of NCLB accountability on schools. Rand has studies of school effectiveness and of whole school reform programs created by the US Dept of Education.

## <http://www.ccsso.org/>

“The Council of Chief State School Officers is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.”

## Course Evaluation Plan

All student work must demonstrate academic and research rigor of doctoral-level quality. Your work should be professionally presented and worthy of being included in your portfolio.

**Grading**

1. Item Analysis Report 40 Points

Part 1 Classical Test Theory = 20 (due week 5)

Part 2 Modern Test Theory = 20 (due week 8)

1. Readings and online/classroom discussion 40 Points
2. Evaluation plan/design 30 Points
3. Classroom presentation (week 8 & 9) 20 Points
4. Mid-Term (Week 5) 20 Points
5. Final Exam (Week 10) 30 Points

**Total 180 Points**

**Percentage Score to Grade Conversion Table**

A=95-100%; A- =90-94.5%; B+ = 85-89.5; B = 80-84.5; B-=75-79.5; C=70-74.5; F= Less than 70%

All assignments are required. Student work will be evaluated on a rubric.

**Course Agenda**

*(Subject to change)*

*Textbook and article readings, marked with an asterisk (\*) on pages 6-8, are due for the week in which they are posted.*

**Note**:

FSW = Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen. Program Evaluation.

R&S = Ryan & Shepherd. The future of test-based educational accountability**.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Date** | **Weekly Seminar Topics/Activities** | **Weekly Readings\*** |
| 1 | 6/21/14 | * History of Accountability Testing | * Read syllabus on-line. * R&S 1, 2 |
| 2 | 6/28/14  *No face-to-face class* | * Accountability in California and the USA. * Data analysis with Excel *(follow directions on handout)* | * R&S 3 * FSW 1 & 2 |
| 3 | 7/12/14 | * Assessment, Measurement, and Evaluation * New Standards CCSS, NGSS & Assessments | * R&S 4, 5 * *Bring your assessment data to class* |
| 4 | 7/19/14 | * CTT: Item Characteristics: Item difficulty & discrimination; Reliability & SEM * *Expertise and Consumer-Oriented Models; Objective-Oriented Eval.; Utility Standards* | * Frisbieor Traub * FSW 4, 6 |
| 5 | 7/26/14 | * Validity * *Decision Oriented Eval. Approaches* * Mid-Term Exam | * Messick or B&M * R&S 13 * FSW 7, 8 |
| 6 | 8/2/14 | * Formative Assessment * Assessing ELs & Students with Special Needs * IRT: Intro to modern test theory * *Participant Oriented Eval. Approaches; Comparative Analysis of Evals.* * *Accuracy Standards* | * R&S 15 * FSW 9 & 10 * Black et al. * Kieffer et al. |
| 7 | 8/9/14 | * Standard setting * Introduction to Rasch measurement | * BB—2 Cizek * FSW 11-13 |
| 8 | 8/16/14 | * Rasch: Fit analysis * Rasch: Equating and Linking * Presentations | * FSW 14-15 |
| 9 | 8/123/14 | * Rasch approach to Validity * Presentations | * R&S ch 6, 8 * FSW 16 &17 |
| 10 | 8/30/14 | * Presentations * Final Exam |  |

**Course Policies.**

Attendance: It is important to attend class, arrive on time and remain for the entire session, be prepared for activities and assignments, and actively participate in discussions and activities. You must attend at least 10 sessions to be eligible for a grade of A and 8 sessions for a passing grade. Partial absences (tardiness or leaving early) are deducted from attendance and participation totals.

Rewrites: Assignments turned in **on time** can be re-written once for a possible higher grade. Original work must be submitted WITH rewrite. All rewrites are due ONE SESSION after the original work is returned. Late work grade is reduced one letter grade per week late.

Academic honesty: Plagiarism and cheating are violations of the Student Discipline Code and may be dealt with by both the instructor and the Judicial Affairs Officer. Plagiarism is the presentation as one’s own, the ideas and writing of another. Plagiarism is academically dishonest and subjects the offending student to penalties up to and including expulsion. Students must make appropriate acknowledgements of the original source where material written or complied by another is used.

(CSUSB Bulletin, 2001-2002, p. 57.)

Definition of plagiarism/cheating:

Plagiarism is the act of presenting the ideas and writings of another as one’s own. Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means.

Cheating includes but is not limited to:

Copying, in part or in whole, from o test, software, or other evaluation instrument. Submitting work previously graded in another course unless this has been approved by the course instructor or by departmental policy. Submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses, unless this has been approved by both course instructors or by the department policies of both departments. Using or consulting during an examination sources or materials not authorized by the instructor. Altering or interfering with grading or grading instructions. Sitting for an examination by a surrogate, or as a surrogate. Any other act committed by a student in the course of his or her academic work, which defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding or abetting in any of the actions defined above.

Plagiarism is academically dishonest and makes the offending student liable to penalties up to and including expulsion. Students must make appropriate acknowledgements of the original source where material written or compiled by another is used.”

Source: CSUSB Faculty Senate: Policy and Procedures concerning Academic

Dishonesty.Educational Policy and Resources Committee. Policy Manual FSD 96-12.R1.

## Commitment to Diversity

In our commitment to the furthering of knowledge and fulfilling our educational mission, California State University, San Bernardino seeks a campus climate that welcomes, celebrates, and promotes respect for the entire variety of human experience. In our commitment to diversity, we welcome people from all backgrounds and we seek to include knowledge and values from many cultures in the curriculum and extra-curricular life of the campus community. Dimensions of diversity shall include, but are not limited to, the following: race, ethnicity, religious belief, sexual orientation, sex/gender, disability, socioeconomic status, cultural orientation, national origin, and age. (from the CSU San Bernardino University Diversity Committee Statement of Commitment to Diversity, 1995)

In keeping with the university’s Commitment to Diversity, the faculty of the College of Education fully support the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Faculty will provide reasonable accommodation to any student with a disability who is registered with the Office of Services to Students with Disabilities and who needs and requests accommodation. If you are in need of an accommodation for a disability in order to participate in this class, please let us know ASAP and also contact Services to Students with Disabilities at UH-183, (909)537-5238.

**Quotations**

In his article, "Psychometric Experiments," Sir Francis Galton defined "psychometry" as the "art of imposing measurement and number upon operations of the mind". He then argued that "until the phenomena of any branch of knowledge have been subjected to measurement and numbers, it cannot assume the status of dignity of a science". His work illustrated what he called the psychometric side of anthropology.

.

Larry H. Ludlow

Boston College

Galton, F. (1879). Psychometric experiments. Brain: A Journal of Neurology, II, 149- 162

*There is nothing more difficult to plan, more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to manage than the creation of a new system. For the initiator has the enmity of all who would profit by the preservation of the old institutions, and merely lukewarm defenders in those who should gain by the new ones.*

*Machiavelli*