

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: _____ Social Studies Education _____ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** _____ Daniel A. Clark _____

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. SSE Program Assessment #1—State Licensing Tests. Performance on State Licensing Test, to assess how well program completers grasped the concepts, knowledge and skills of the six content areas (Economics, Geography, Government, History, Psychology and Sociology) within the major. Aligned chiefly with National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) disciplinary standards 2.1-2.5, but also mapped to assess thematic standards (noted below) 1.1-1.10.</p>	<p>State licensing exam results. These exams are taken by program completers (graduates). Data are pulled from the Indiana Department of Education once per year.</p>	<p>The SSE program has no criteria other than passage of the test (scoring 220 points). The program ideally needs to maintain an overall 80% passage rate.</p>	<p>Two areas, Economics and Government, saw 100% passing rates. This was a typical result for Government, but an improvement for Economics, although only two program completers took the exam. The History pass rate improved from 44% to 58%, beating the state average. The Geography pass rate improved slightly to 40% and beat the state average (this has been a monstrously difficult test over the years). No SSE completers took the Sociology exam. Psychology pass rates declined from 100% to 50% (4 test-takers). An examination of passing rates in subject area sub-themes, reveals fair consistency with past years. Slight improvements in all Government subthemes</p>	<p>Since the Pearson licensing exams are thankfully going away in the summer of 2021, and they are not nationally normed and very uneven in their difficulty, I hesitate to consider any adaptation based solely on the passage rates or sub-theme breakdowns for these exams. Frankly I am very pleased that these exams are going away, replaced by nationally normed exams. It will be challenging to gauge how SSE completer performance can translate into actionable changes until a few years of the new exams, but it will be a welcome change. The program coordinator will continue to push advanced SSE students to take these exams seriously and prepare for them as much as possible.</p>

			occurred, while in History, performance fell in US History. Psychology saw a marked decline in the Biological Basis of Behavior.	The coordinator began emphasizing this to all advisees and SSE students in his methods classes a couple of years ago.
2. SSE Program Assessment #3-- Ability to plan engaging and informative lesson plans, at appropriate depth within the six content areas (noted above, required by the NCSS as part of CAEP accreditation—NCSS disciplinary standards 2.1-2.5), along with (potentially) ten thematic standards of the NCSS: 1.1 Culture and Cultural Diversity; 1.2 Time, Continuity and Change; 1.3 People, Places and Environments; 1.4 Individual Human Development and Identity; 1.5 Individuals, Groups and Institutions; 1.6 Power, Authority and Governance; 1.7 Production, Distribution and Consumption; 1.8 Science, Technology and Society; 1.9 Global Connections and Interdependence; and 1.10 Civic Ideals and Practices	Unit Report following clinical teaching experience in CIMT 400/400L, normally monitored through dual enrollment in SS 306, although the SSE Program Coordinator also examines unit reports of SSE students even during the semester SS 306 is not offered (the spring).	For purposes of accreditation through the National Council for Social Studies and CAEP, the program must evaluate the ability of students to effectively plan within 10 thematic standards and 5 disciplinary standards. The ISU SSE program has developed detailed rubrics for each of these standards with anywhere from 4-7 criteria within a thematic standard or disciplinary standard, all focused on proper understanding of content and the usage of appropriate resources (this should be housed in the Assessment office library). Students are rated as Exceeds, Meets or Does Not Meet on how they meet each criteria within a standard. The program establishes no expectations other than that all students will at least “meet” the standards.	Space does not permit a summary of how students performed in all 15 of the different areas evaluated. Suffice to say that all achieved a “meets” or “exceeds.” Overall 11 students were assessed this past academic year. It proved an odd year, in that no students had clinical experiences in Government or Economics. There was a preponderance of History clinicals. There was a strong showing of “Exceeds” ratings across all disciplinary and thematic standards for the resources category. There was a slight drop-off in the number of exceeds in the use of such resources in ways that promote critical thinking—just not as many I the coordinator would like to see, since this is stressed in the program.	This is the third iteration of this assessment with a more detailed rubric. The key areas that the coordinator monitors are the “skills” categories, i.e. how students utilizing outside resources to craft inquiry-based assignments and activities. As reported in the previous column, this cohort did not integrate as many such highly valued activities or assignments that met the “exceeds” category. All integrated one for a “meets”, but the coordinator expects more and will communicate this more emphatically in the methods course.
3. SSE Program Assessment #4—Student Teaching Evaluations, again aligned with NCSS disciplinary and thematic standards noted above.	SSE students enrolled in CIMT 401/402—student teaching. Student teachers enrolled in this course for the SSE program typically have an 8-week teaching placement at both the high school and the middle-school setting. The	The ISU SSE program has developed a rubric and assessment form for host teachers (should be in Assessment Library) that allows host teachers to assess a student-teachers ability to both plan and then execute a	Thirteen student teaching evaluations were received for the Fall ’19 and Spring ’20 academic year. A strong majority of “Exceeds” ratings occurred (consistently in the sixty percent range), with no “Does Not Meet” ratings. For	No “red flags” or alarms appear in the data. In fact it was a pretty strong year based on the percentage of “exceeds”. SSE student teachers continue to demonstrate solid performance.

	number of evaluations usually exceeds the number of students in student teaching, as students (hopefully) are evaluated in each placement.	lesson. Planning and teaching are assessed separately then for each NCSS disciplinary standard (2.1-2.5) and thematic standards (1.1-1.10), the latter most relevant during the middle-school placement.	some reason several of the high school disciplinary categories were incomplete. This could have been due to the COVID-19 problem, where most student-teachers were unable to complete their second placement.	
4. SSE Program Assessment #5-- Ability to present evidence of teaching effectiveness, again assessed to align with the NCSS disciplinary and thematic standards noted above.	Evidence presented by Student in a Unit Report performed in CIMT 400 after a clinical field experience (prior to student teaching). Students usually are co-enrolled in SS 306, although the ISU SSE Coordinator receives these unit reports even in the semester when SS 306 does not meet (the spring)—btw, through advising we try to make sure most SSE students co-enroll in CIMT 400 and SS 306 in the Fall.	The program has no minimum expectations other than all students must “meet” performance criteria or be remediated. CIMT 400 instituted an expanded rubric for assessing the clinical teaching experience last year. Instead of just two categories to rate teaching effectiveness, now there are five (Pre and Post Tests, and Daily Formative Assessments; Modifications based on Daily Analysis of Learner Differences; Pre and Post Test Analysis; Data-Based Instructional Adjustments; and Instructional Strategies, Activities and Assessments). The SSE program, then examines a clinical student’s teaching effectiveness within the applicable 15 NCSS thematic and disciplinary standards.	This year SSE clinical experiences allowed for 12 of the possible 15 NCSS standards to be evaluated for teaching effectiveness. The majority (50% or 60%) were exceeds in most areas. The CIMT 400 rubric added two ratings below “Meets”—“Developing” and “Emerging”. The SSE program chose to interpret either as a “Does Not Meet”. As such there were several Does Not Meet ratings, but this owed almost completely to the fact that 3 out of the five students doing their clinical experiences in the Spring of 2020 could not perform their post tests due to the Covid-19 issue.	No alarms emerge from the data this year. SSE students demonstrate strong competency in using data to assess their own teaching effectiveness.
5. SSE Program Assessment #6-- Performance on internal content area tests to gage their basic competence in all six of the content areas, something that reflects the “core” social studies courses	These exams are administered in SS 306 taken during the Fall semester of each year.	Each student has multiple attempts to take each exam and is rated based on how many attempts it take for them to pass the exams with a 70% score. The program has established no	Thirteen students took the practice exams this past year. Overall their performance was not as strong as the previous year. The percentage of “Exceeds” was down in all areas. Students	The coordinator will need to monitor the slight drop-off in performance to see if a trend develops. The stronger performance in the Government exam conforms to the success on the

<p>required of all majors and a competent knowledge base required of middle-school social studies teachers. Aligned with NCSS disciplinary standards noted above and available in the outcomes library.</p>		<p>expectations aside from the expectation that all students pass the exams.</p>	<p>continue to do pretty well in the Government and Economics exams (the highest number of “Exceeds”.</p>	<p>licensing exams in Government, although I have little faith in the quality of the Pearson exams generally.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- 1) Cohort Sizes 2) Year-to-Year Retention 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)
1. Cohort Sizes: 2016—75; 2017—75; 2018—90; 2019—87; Fall 2020—99. Clearly the number of SSE majors is trending upward. I would guess that this trend might not continue in the years ahead, owing to the BCOE’s decision to increase the required minimum GPA to graduate to a 3.0. This will likely trim the numbers of SSE majors somewhat, though anecdotally, I do not think it will register a steep decline.
 2. The year-to-year (Fall-to Fall) retention rates for first year SSE majors from Fall 2015 to Fall 2020 (FA19 freshmen) are: Fall 2016—65%; Fall 2017—67%; Fall 2018—87%; Fall 2019—76%; Fall 2020—80%. Clearly here the trend has been upward, though this likely has little to do with the SSE program at all, and reflects recruitment of better students.
 3. Five-Year Graduation Rate: for Fall 2009 cohort—48%; Fall 2010 cohort—52%; Fall 2011 cohort—50%; Fall 2012 cohort—47%; Fall 2013 cohort—54%; Fall 2014 cohort—41%. The latest cohort was in the “middling” range compared with other CAS majors. The previous years’ graduation rates, however, are consistently in the top 5 of CAS programs.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

The SSE program has little control over the cohort sizes or the first-year retention rate, except that the program maintains a solid reputation. The five-year graduation rate is decent historically compared to other CAS programs. The coordinator will continue to promote strong advising and perform surveys of advanced SSE majors with follow ups on potential problems. The coordinator typically performs such surveys twice per years around advising “season”.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

With the increase in minimum gpa requirements for all education majors, I would expect to see the graduation rate possibly increase slightly over the next several years, since (theoretically) the major will retain higher caliber students. Aside from continued strong advising and career-readiness activities in the methods courses, the coordinator does not see any new significant opportunities for improvement.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)**
SSE student performance in the program assessments have remained pretty consistent and positive. As noted above, on the positive side, well over 50% of host-teachers assessed our SSE students in the “Exceeds” category in their student teaching evaluations. The only area for some concern, also noted above, was the slight drop-off in the number of students reaching the “Exceeds” category with regard to working up multiple “inquiry-based” activities and assignments using primary or outside resources. Performance on the licensing exams remains worrisome, but again as noted, with the horrible Pearson exams scheduled to be replaced, the coordinator feels it prudent to wait to see how performance on the new exams proceeds.
- 2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
As noted above, most of the plans of action involve continuing to stress the importance of enhanced preparation before taking the licensing exams, and a continued stressing in SS 305 and SS 306 on using outside resources to craft inquiry-based and critical-thinking activities and assignments. Other than that, the program will simply continue to monitor the weak areas of performance in History and Geography, particularly World History. I also plan on trying to communicate the necessity for revising the licensing exams (rather than just altering the provider) by contacting state-level officials.
- 3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
SSE assessment attention will remain focused on key outcomes just noted in #2. The program will continue to assess all five of the assessments.
- 4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**
The coordinator will meet with the Department Chairs of the affiliated subject areas to relay any concerns. Psychology and Sociology content areas have been significantly revised in the last several years. Of particular concern this year will be the revision of Geography and Economics. These discussions of course changes, however, do not stem as much from poor performance on the licensing exams (although poor performance does factor into the Geography revision ideas) as much as retirements and new classes being taught in those departments.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: B.S. Social Studies Education	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are clear, measurable, and demonstrate alignment with critical standards for licensure and professional preparedness. • Assessment data are taken from a variety of sources across the curriculum and include different types of performance data (i.e., written work, teaching, licensure and content exams). • For program-based assessments, rubrics are used to determine performance relative to outcomes. • Great notes on insights gained from student performance using rubrics and teaching evaluations, including notes on possible impacts from covid. Clear insights into limitations of standard testing, as well as identified areas to monitor. • Clear plans for using results, in many cases for monitoring known issues and changes with exams, as well as for sharing results with faculty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
Performance Goals & Measures	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p>
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.