Assessment of student learning is a systemic, systematic, and continuous process. California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) uses processes for assessing student learning informed by best practices. In support of the WSCUC standards of accreditation, faculty members are responsible for the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels. These assessment activities are a critical component of successful teaching and assist our faculty in improving learning opportunities for our students.

To make assessment efforts at CSUB more visible, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA), with the help and assistance of the School and GE assessment coordinators and ITS web services, has developed a publicly available web-page using a "honeycomb" structure (figure 1), modeled after the NILOA Transparency Framework, to display assessment activities at the university. This "honeycomb" representation is currently available for Program Assessment and GE Assessment; a similar web-site for co-curricular assessment of Student Affairs is being developed. The purpose of these websites is to serve as a central location for assessment-related information and resources at CSUB. We hope that you will find it useful and informative. The hexagon titled, “Department Assessment” is password protected to maintain data confidentiality. The URL for program assessment website is as follows: http://www.csub.edu/irpa/Program_Assessment/index.html.

The information and resources in the various assessment websites are intended to support the assessment of student learning at CSUB. Presently, users can toggle between Program and GE assessment websites. Once completed there will be a web link between Student Affairs Program and GE Assessment websites.

In regards to the program and co-curricular assessment, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment has the following responsibilities:

- Administer Taskstream, a web-based assessment management system that helps management, accountability, assessment, planning, and quality improvement processes for programs, department and schools
- Provide ongoing logistical support of assessment to academic, co-curricular and administrative departments, through data collection and analysis, to "closing the loop"
- Support, and closely collaborate with, faculty-led committees on assessment of student learning, including general education outcomes
- Promote a culture of transparent assessment and evidence based planning and decision making
The School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering (NSME) consists of seven departments offering thirteen baccalaureate degrees and two graduate degrees. Over 100 faculty serve around 2,700 full-time equivalent students yearly, of whom more than 1,350 are NSME majors. Graduates of NSME typically enter the workforce as researchers, teachers, nurses, or industry employees, or they advance to graduate programs in top research universities nationwide.

NSME was recognized by Excelencia in Education as the 2012 National Example of Excelencia at the Baccalaureate level.

For more information about the school of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering please visit www.csub.com/nsme

NSME Highlights

CARL KLOOCK

As the theme of this year’s newsletter is “Making Assessment Visible”, it is appropriate to highlight assessment efforts that have taken place in the school of Natural Science, Mathematics & Engineering (NSME), and to point out how these assessment efforts have been made available on the new CSUB departmental assessment website, highlighted in the introduction to the Newsletter.

Engineering Sciences.

Engineering Sciences faces not only University WideWSCUC accreditation, but also Accreditation at the departmental level through ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.). They have recently been visited for their first accreditation, and their exemplary assessment procedures are part of the reason for reaching this stage. They will hear about the result of the accreditation process from ABET during August 2019.

Engineering Science has eleven Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), which can be viewed on the CSUB assessment website. All eleven PLOs were assessed in the last two years, with seven assessed in 2015-2016 and eight in 2016-2017 (four were assessed in both years). While all of the measurements were at the course level, both direct and indirect assessments were used and several PLOs were measured as part of the senior design project, providing integration across the program. The program also exemplifies responses to assessment, or “closing the loop”. For those PLOs on which students did not meet the target, concrete modifications to the program have been proposed and implemented. Thus, the assessment efforts for the BS in Engineering Sciences not only meet the compliance goals of assessment for CSUB and two different accreditation agencies (ABET and WSCUC), but demonstrate the more important assessment goal of modifying their program in response to data (i.e. “closing the loop”, the theme of the last newsletter) to improve student learning and experience in their program.

Nursing.

Nursing’s assessment uses an externally validated instrument, the ATI RN Comprehensive Predictor, to assess nine clearly articulated PLOs each year. Thus Nursing has chosen not to assess individual courses, but to use a program-wide assessment structure. Nursing’s PLO’s are tied directly to the Comprehensive Predictor, which provides a detailed summary of knowledge and dispositions for CSUB’s nursing candidates and is used by many Nursing programs throughout the country: The results of this instrument provide sufficient detail that weaknesses discovered can be addressed at the level of individual concepts, content areas, or larger scales when appropriate.

The repeated use of this external instrument allows nursing to easily track changes over time in student success and stay up to date with changes in the profession as they are reflected by the Comprehensive Predictor. Thus, Nursing is well placed to respond not only to any problems detected by their assessment but has developed a system that is inherently dynamic and will respond to changes in their field in a timely fashion.

Both Nursing and Engineering Sciences have developed assessment structures that provide relevant information about student learning and experiences in their majors. However, as these brief summaries demonstrate, they have done so in quite different ways. Engineering Sciences has developed a comprehensive series of course-level instruments tailored directly to the specific needs of their program, while Nursing has leveraged the existence of a comprehensive, externally validated instrument that also targets their learning goals and ties directly into the body of knowledge required for state licensure and professional nursing practices.

Making assessment visible is not just something we need to do to comply with WSCUC, though that is certainly part of the justification for doing so. Making assessment visible is a natural and necessary part of the development of a robust and useful University. Each department has conducted its own experiments in assessment. Although we highlight and commend those programs that are doing assessment well, the truth is that while some programs have done assessment well, some have struggled. We can maintain our academic silos and refuse to share what we have learned, both good and bad, with each other, or we can communicate with each other, build upon what works, and avoid repeating efforts that are less successful: this is how knowledge progresses. By communicating our successes and failures, we learn together, and can improve – yes, we can improve assessment, but that is not the “real” goal. If we use assessment well, we can improve student learning and experiences, and thus the quality of the University as a whole. This is the ultimate goal of assessment; making our assessment efforts visible is crucial to reaching that goal.
Reflecting on Program Assessment in the School of Arts and Humanities

CAROL DELL’AMICO

Program assessment on the CSUB campus began taking firm shape following the last successful reaffirmation effort. The accelerated creation of faculty networks and learning opportunities ensued, and the positions of School Assessment Coordinator were created. This article presents the current way assessment takes place in the School of Arts and Humanities and outlines a recommended direction that has crystallized in the wake of the university’s latest period of self-reflection as it moves toward a new reaffirmation.

Currently in Arts and Humanities, for the most part, chairs or department program assessment coordinators become the department’s designated assessment experts until the next chair or coordinator is designated. Under this arrangement, anyone who must assess a Program Learning Outcome (PLO) in one of their classes; meet with faculty to arrive at a plan, in some cases; collect findings; and enter all information into Taskstream. Chairs and coordinators are also in contact with the School Assessment Coordinator as issues or questions arise.

While someone within a department needs to lead assessment efforts, this approach to assessment nonetheless leaves most faculty out of crucial steps and aspects of the assessment process—some faculty members’ contact with assessment might be as slight as being contacted every few years to assess a learning outcome in one of their classes. In any event, only chairs and coordinators—who serve up to three, six, or more years—have constant exposure to the entire assessment process. Consequently, they develop a good understanding of the assessment method, become familiar with Taskstream’s attributes, and are likely to have a firm grasp on the core assessment principle of alignment (the interlocking relationship of course and program student learning outcomes, as illustrated in the curriculum map).

It goes without saying that assessment will become more meaningful the more a greater number of faculty understand the process. Beyond this, Taskstream data, department Annual Reports, Program Review documents, and school Annual Assessment Reports are all considered to be (in part or whole) assessment efforts that have to be made available for WSCUC viewing and review. WSCUC is our accrediting agency, and, without accreditation, our students are not eligible to receive federal financial aid; nor will their classes be listed in the curriculum map.

What this means is that faculty might best approach assessment as not only the business of assessing student learning, but also as the practice of reporting the data for collection and review. Taskstream data is now packaged for easy, quite accessible WSCUC review, and some of the material is even publicly accessible on our university website. There is every reason to make a good showing in Taskstream.

Ideally, then, moving forward, all faculty within Arts and Humanities will be more regularly exposed to the logic and process of assessment. Faculty will learn how the various parts of program assessment fit together—and the need to train each new department chair or program assessment coordinator from scratch will be obviated. The recommended path will also demystify Taskstream, as it involves the active use of the database.

At the first or second department meeting of the new academic year, time is set aside for assessment (and Program Learning Outcomes might be sent along with the meeting agenda).

At the meeting, during the assessment session, the first thing the assessment leader does is log into Taskstream in real time (this will help dispel the notion that logging in takes more than a few seconds).

Next, the leader navigates to the program page or calls up the department’s Five-Year Assessment Plan, which should now be stored in the Planning Documents and Reports area. Looking at the Five-Year Plan, faculty can then see which PLOs were assessed the previous year and which are scheduled to be assessed in the coming year.

The leader can then open the PLO section itself, so that faculty can see where the PLOs are stored online, and following this, the previous year’s Plans, Findings (and possibly Status Report and Action Plan) might be reviewed—by the leader actually opening these areas, however briefly. A discussion of how program faculty plan on ‘closing’ any ‘loops’ from the previous year’s assessment can ensue.

Following this, if the five-year plan doesn’t already designate this, faculty can decide whose classes in the coming year should be involved in assessing the current year’s PLOs. This is the moment to open the Curriculum Map for viewing, so that faculty can see where it is stored and which courses correspond to the given PLOs.*

As to the new year’s assessment plans, brief input might be solicited as to how the assessing might take place (or not so brief, depending on a department’s predilections). Faculty directly involved in the year’s assessment can of course be the final arbiters of plans and can proceed as they wish individually or as a group—with this detailed planning taking place outside of the department meeting.

If the fine details of assessment planning are arranged outside of the meeting, this entire process will not take much time outside of the discussion on how to ‘close the loop’—if there is a need for such a discussion.

This simple approach to program assessment through Taskstream might not only help faculty understand the concept of curriculum alignment, which is at the heart of assessment, but also encourage faculty to begin exploring the database and university webpages associated with it (together, assessment leaders and the School Assessment Coordinator can ensure that every faculty member has a Taskstream account). Faculty will learn that they can “affiliate” with a CSUB program they wish to on Taskstream to explore that program’s PLOs and assessments. In this way, diverse assessment strategies will be learned. Further, as the understanding of assessment grows within a department, PLOs and rubrics are likely to undergo refinement as needed. Faculty will even eventually be in a position to know at a glance in which years a PLO was previously assessed (by opening up older Five-Year Plans). This means that, as an assessment plan is formulated, past assessments of the PLO can be quickly reviewed. The new plan might then involve a new assessment method—for example, something other than a direct assessment of student artifacts. Or, a student survey might be added to a direct assessment or even substituted for one if previous assessments have affirmed the program and the program has not greatly changed. In this second case, the new assessment would actually involve less work, and something unexpected might be learned. Either way, this way of approaching program assessment through Taskstream will not add to the faculty assessment burden—the number of faculty assessing in any given year will remain the same.

A&H faculty, on the whole, have not been highly motivated to grasp the principles and rationale for assessment owing to the impression that assessment data has no life after it is generated and deposited into Taskstream. However, given the efforts that have gone into making the data easily available, this is manifestly no longer the case. Yet, in addition, there has been the enduring concern within A&H that the PLO/Five-Year Assessment Cycle structure cannot fully describe all that Humanities programs do. The concern about the limitations of PLOs is understood. The request is simply that PLOs describe the important skills, knowledge, and competencies that can be adequately described and assessed.

*The procedure to assess a PLO, when it makes sense, is to assess in a course or courses in which the skill or knowledge is developed as far as the program allows, whether that level is mastery in the skill, competency, or what have you. In the case of expected mastery, then, the program will have been affirmed if the target number of majors near or at graduation show mastery. If the target is not reached, then ‘closing the loop’ will involve assessing all of the courses in which the skill is introduced, developed, and so on. A sensible first step would be to review course syllabi connected to the PLO to ascertain whether a sufficient amount of course time and an adequate number/type of assignments correspond to the skill/knowledge area.

For more information about the school of Arts and Humanities, please visit: www.csub.edu/ah
In Spring 2018, the AIMS (Achieving Integration & Mastering Skills) program launched a new webpage to make general education assessment efforts readily accessible, useful, and meaningful to multiple audiences. Based upon the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) Transparency Framework, the webpage utilizes a “honeycomb” graphic with six clickable areas.

The top left portal takes users to a listing of the general education program learning outcomes as well as the learning outcomes for each of the different area requirements in the general education program. The top right portal takes users to information about assessment plans, findings, and closing the loop efforts focused on the WSCUC Core Competencies, that is, oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy.

The bottom left portal presents information on the previous five-year assessment cycle, the current five-year assessment plan, and the annual reports of the assessment activities and findings for the current five-year cycle. The bottom right portal contains two curriculum maps, one showing the relationship between the general education area requirements and the program learning outcomes, and the other showing the relationship between the approved general education courses and the program learning outcomes.

The portal on the far-left side takes users to the General Education Home Page. This page provides details about the AIMS program for both students and faculty. For example, students can find information about general education course requirements, a listing of courses approved for general education credit and how to apply for a substitution or waiver. Faculty can find information about upcoming faculty development workshops, the course requirements for the various general education areas, and the process for approving new courses.

The ride-side portal takes users to the Program Assessment Home Page. This page contains information about assessment activities for all of the disciplinary-based academic programs at CSUB.

Please peruse the new site at https://www.csub.edu/ge/ge-assessment/index.html. If you have suggestions for improvement or are having difficulty finding what you are looking for, please contact the GE Assessment Coordinator, Michael Ault.
As a major part of AACSB reaccreditation efforts, the School of Business and Public Administration (BPA) has systems and processes in place for assuring high-quality learning and teaching environment. This involves determining program learning goals that are relevant and appropriate, as well as designing and delivering curricula to maximize the potential for achieving the expected learning and teaching outcomes. These systems and processes assess whether the learning goals have been met and inform opportunities for improvement. The following are the several general characteristics of the curriculum:

(i) Curricula address general content areas—skills and knowledge.
(ii) Curricula facilitate and encourage active student engagement in learning.
(iii) Curricula facilitate and encourage active student engagement in learning; (iii) curricula facilitate and encourage active student engagement in learning; (iv) Educational programs are structured to ensure consistent, high-quality education for the same degree programs regardless of differences and changes in technology and delivery modes.

ANGAPPA GUNASEKARAN

CSUB MPA Program Assessment Plan

CSUB’s MPA program is accredited by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA). One of the ways our program demonstrates to NASPAA our commitment to quality public service education is by having a robust assessment plan. Like most assessment plans, ours too has room for improvement. One area in which we want to make improvements is the use of indirect measures. We will be improving how we gather and use feedback from students, internship supervisors, employers, alumni, and community board members. We will seek feedback about the content of our curriculum as well as perceptions about the preparedness of our graduates for public sector work. Our goal is to use a combination of direct measures and indirect measures to have a well-rounded assessment process.

CHANDRA COMURRI

The School of Business & Public Administration (BPA) at CSU Bakersfield is YOUR local opportunity for educational excellence. We offer a wide range of programs to meet the needs of Bakersfield, Kern County, and the Antelope Valley’s future leaders in business, public administration, and non-profit management. Our graduates are well-prepared to address the challenging issues facing businesses and organizations in our region. As a student in BPA, you’ll acquire valuable communication, critical thinking, research, and analytical skills that will help you succeed in any career.
Because of the accreditation standards of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA), the School of Business and Public Administration (BPA) has focused intensively on assessment of student learning to demonstrate student achievement of disciplinary knowledge and broad academic skills. The following sections highlight assessment activities for one program from each of the School’s departments.

**Business (Management, Marketing, Accounting, and Finance)**

**Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA)**

To assess the BSBA program, the learning goals for the program included the skills areas of communication, quantitative and qualitative problem solving, functional area knowledge and ethical decision-making. Faculty and members of the business community, as critical skills necessary for graduate success in the workplace, have identified the aforementioned skills. All four goals were assessed twice between 2014-2015 and 2017-2018. The faculty, the Assessment Review and Curriculum Committee (ARCC), and the BSBA committee have relied on the MyWritingLabPlus (MWLP) program to assess improvement in writing, oral presentations in MKTG 3000 (300) and BA 4908 (490) to assess oral communication, embedded problems in economics to assess quantitative and qualitative reasoning, the Business Achievement Test (BAT) to assess functional knowledge, and the Defining Issues Test 2 (DIT2) to assess moral knowledge and ethical reasoning.

In general, students demonstrated significant improvement in writing in early iterations of the MWLP; however, the effect of the program has declined in recent years. These results have been traced to test fatigue as the MWLP is used in multiple courses in the BSBA curriculum and in other courses at the university. The BSBA program has minimized use of the MWLP as a result. Noted deficiencies in writing resulting from the MWLP and from writing assessments across the BSBA curriculum have prompted the development of a course module on writing in MGMT 3000 (300). Regarding oral communication, performance expectations have not been met in MKTG 3000 (300) or MGMT 4000 (BA 490). As a result, the School has developed a Student Professional Development Initiative to instruct students in all BPA majors in the professional skills necessary to make an effective self-presentation. Students in economics classes have had difficulty achieving design, analysis, and interpretation standards, prompting economics instructors to increase the use of repeated examples in ECON 2018 (201). Given CSUB students lower than average admissions test scores compared to other campuses of the CSU, BSBA student scores on the BAT have remained fairly consistent over the last four years. The one exception has been a steady decline in scores on the management section of the test. The faculty have traced this decline to some degree to inconsistent pedagogy across different sections of the primary management classes. This finding has prompted the development of course binders for each core course to provide a consistent template for both permanent and part-time faculty.

**Economics and Environmental Resource Management**

**Bachelor of Science in Economics**

To assess the BS in Economics, the learning goals included communication, quantitative reasoning, economics knowledge, and authentic application to real-world problems. Economics has used the final research paper in ECON 4908 and MWLP to assess communication, in-class problems in upper-division classes to assess quantitative reasoning, the ETS Economics Subject Test/In-class assignments to assess economics knowledge, and research projects to evaluate application to real-world problems.

The assessments conducted in the Department led to several specific actions:
1. The Department decided to move from the ETS exam to the department designed economics exam to focus the exam more directly on the material taught in the curriculum.
2. The inconsistent results on quantitative reasoning prompted the Department to completely redesign ECON 2200 (220) to:
   A. Consult faculty using quant methods in upper division econ and business admin courses.
   - Develop and prioritize list of quant topics and applications used in subsequent courses;
   - Revise Econ 220 topic outline;
   - Secure volunteers to develop Econ 220 questions/problems in key application areas; and
   - Discuss incentives & pedagogical strategies to increase students’ time investment in practice and homework.
3. The negative results for the use of MWLP in ECON 2018 and 2028 prompted the Department to change strategies and focus on the writing components of the new general education program:
   - Minimum of two full-time faculty attended General Education workshops focusing on the required library research component and writing reinforcement.
   - Workshop ideas and rubrics were shared with adjuncts and non-attending faculty in a department meeting focusing on implementation of the new GE program in ECON 1000, 2018, and 2026.
   - Assignments and assessment strategies will be integrated into Fall 2016 master syllabi for Econ 1000, 2018, and 2026.

**Public Policy and Administration**

**Master of Science in Health Care Administration**

To assess the Master of Science in Health Care Administration, the learning goals included competence in broad integrative knowledge, specialized knowledge of health care administration, critical thinking, and applying learning.

The program has used class assignments to assess each of the learning outcomes. In general, students have had difficulty in demonstrating each competency. Earlier assessments based on an older set of learning outcomes demonstrated similar difficulties with written communication, ethical reasoning, and team building. Using a pretest and posttest in PPA 4010, analytical reasoning goals were met, as were research design skills based on grades on a research design.

The most critical issue for the MSA-HCM program was the lack of separation between the Master of Public Administration program and the MSA-HCM program. This issue was highlighted in the external reviewer’s report of May 2012. Most importantly, the overlap has prevented the MSA-HCM program from achieving the learning outcomes for health care administration programs proposed by the Healthcare Leadership Alliance (HLA) the Commission on Accreditation for Healthcare Management Education (CAHME). The UPRC noted the discrepancy in the committee’s June 5, 2012, memorandum and recommended that the Department propose elevation of the MSA-HCM degree from a concentration to a full degree program.

In response, the PPA Department has transformed the MSA-HCM from a concentration in the Master of Science in Administration program to a free-standing degree program (the Master of Science in Health Care Administration) in anticipation of the conversion of CSU Bakersfield from quarters to semesters. The MSA-HCM curriculum will be transformed to bring it into direct compliance with the competencies identified by the Healthcare Leadership Alliance (HLA) and the Commission on Accreditation for Healthcare Management Education (CAHME). These competencies include 1) Communication and Relationship Management, 2) Leadership, 3) Professionalism, 4) Knowledge of the Healthcare Environment, and 4) Business Skills and Knowledge.

---

For more information regarding the School of Business and Public Administration please visit: www.csuev.edu/bpa
Virtual Tours Engaging Students in Learning and Success

One cool December morning in San Simeon, CA, I was with my brother and sister who are visiting from Chicago for the holidays. We were on an exhaustive tour of the Central California Coast. One of the “must see” locations is the Hearst Castle, which was designed by renowned pioneering female architect, Julia Morgan and financed by media tycoon William Randolph Hearst.

While waiting for our tour, one of the friendly tour guides introduced herself and asked me where I was from. I told her that I lived in Bakersfield. With great excitement, she responded that she also had lived in Bakersfield for a number of years. Her name was Erin Gates. Erin probed further, wondering whether I had any Dewar’s Candy with me. She also asked where I worked. I told her that I worked at CSUB. Erin told me that she worked in the educational division for the California Department of Parks and Recreation. She explained that Hearst Castle and other California parks offered virtual tours of their facilities through a program called PORTS. It was very busy day at Hearst Castle and we both went our separate ways, after exchanging business cards.

Several weeks later, Erin and I reconnected and talked more about the opportunities that virtual tours could provide to enhance the classroom experience for college students. Erin provided more information about PORTS, explaining its prevalence in the curriculum of many California high schools. PORTS had yet to make it onto the radar of any of the college campuses in California.

After explaining this interesting situation to Paul Newberry, Paul, who is a seasoned professor, became very interested in the PORTS opportunity. Paul immediately recognized the potential that virtual tours held with many general education courses and beyond.

Paul and I led several interest sessions with CSUB faculty and staff to gauge their interest in utilizing the PORTS resource. PORTS sent their Program Manager, Brad Krey to CSUB to lead a group of faculty and staff through a demonstration that included a visit to a kelp forest in Monterey Bay where a sea lion jumped up on the kayak of a park Marshall and added unexpected joy and levity to the session.

Hearst Castle served as an additional virtual tour test site. The possibilities of using the resources of Hearst castle were overwhelming from art history, to art restoration, to zoology, to geography, there were many possible applications of the PORTS Program via Hearst castle.

The faculty and staff that participated in the demonstration were excited about incorporating these resources into their courses and cocurricular experiences for the CSUB community. Seven faculty and two administrators agreed to participate in a pilot program and incorporated PORTS into the curriculum during the spring 2018 semester.

A rigorous assessment plan was developed with the help of the CSUB Student Affairs Assessment Council. Virtual tours were held at a number of different sites including Hearst castle utilized by Emily Poole for her introduction to university life course. Another PORTS site utilized by the library was Angel Island. Angel Island is considered to be the Ellis Island of the west, where millions of immigrants from Asia entered the United States. Angel Island also served as a prisoner of war camp during World War II. Angel Island is a wonderful historic site of significant importance to the United States.

The data is still being collected from the classes that participated in the spring semester pilot program. Initial qualitative results have been very favorable about the PORTS experience. Students found virtual tours added multiple dimensions to the class, making the course more interesting and engaging. Students felt more compelled to attend class as a result of the virtual tours.

Not all the data has been analyzed yet. In the next issue of the Assessment Newsletter, a more detailed presentation of the results will be shared. Engaging students has been identified as one of the 6 Pillars of the Graduation Initiative 2025. It is our hope that the partnership between CSUB and PORTS will help make classes and the curriculum more engaging, interesting and dynamic for CSUB students, in support of student success.

If you’d like more information about participating in virtual tours through the ports program, please contact Dr. Jim Drnek at jdrnek@CSUB.EDU

JAMES DRNEK

What is PORTS?

- A FREE distance learning program that uses the power of California’s K-12 High Speed Network (HSN) and the educational potential of live videoconferencing to help schools teach common core standards in the context of California State Parks

Why PORTS?

- Live, interactive presentations that include science, history, language and other academics
- Fully developed units of study including support and follow up.
- Programs that allow students access to park experts regardless of their geographic location or economic status.

For more information visit: www.ports.parks.ca.gov
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