

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: Teaching and Learning MEd **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Yong Joon Park, yongjoon.park@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<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. Candidates will identify components of educational research including: basic concepts, the research process, procedures, collecting & analyzing data, commonly used methodologies in qualitative, qualitative, or mixed methods and will demonstrate their understanding by designing a research investigation. (G1, G2, G3, G5)</p>	<p>Candidates used their knowledge of basic research concepts and methodologies to design a research investigation.</p> <p>EDUC 610, Research in Education</p> <p>See the attached rubric.</p>	<p>Scores of 80% and above on the research investigation.</p>	<p>Spring 2020 (N=16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of students 91-100% = 14 • #of students 80-90% = 2 <p>Summer 2020 (N=19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of students 100% = 0 • #of students 80-99% = 19 	<p>In the previous year, most of candidates identified components of educational research including: basic concepts, the research process, procedures, collecting & analyzing data, commonly used methodologies in qualitative, qualitative, or mixed methods and demonstrated their understanding by designing a research investigation.</p> <p>At this point, we will be considering the few students who earned under 80% for any assignment/activity to determine if it appears to be an anomaly or if changes need to be made to the course/assignment/activity.</p>

<p>2. Candidates will identify the concept of curriculum, identify and articulate curriculum in American schools from both historical and current perspectives. Candidates will examine and articulate multiple approaches to curriculum development and implementation (G1, G2, G4)</p>	<p>Candidates conducted a curriculum analysis project.</p> <p>EDUC 660, Curriculum Fundamentals</p> <p>Curriculum analysis project will be evaluated according to the following scale which is based upon a system. The course activities will be evaluated according to the following scale which is based upon a system of 300 points:</p> <p>Analyzing the Curriculum/Posner - Total of 300 points</p> <p>Three sets of weekly terms to define. These are based on your readings in the Posner book.</p> <p>Terms Exercise 1 is worth 80 points; Terms Exercise 2 is worth 125 points; Terms Exercise 3 is worth 95 points.</p> <p>660: Student and Course Evaluation</p> <p>Student evaluations will be determined based on the following criteria: A: Exceptional performance indicating complete and comprehensive understanding</p>	<p>Scores of 80% and above on the curriculum analysis project.</p>	<p>Summer 2020 (N=10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of students 100% = 3 • #of students 80-99% = 6 • # of students failed = 1 	<p>In the previous year, most candidates identified the concept of curriculum, identified and articulated curriculum in American schools from both historical and current perspectives. Most candidates examined and articulate multiple approaches to curriculum development and implementation.</p> <p>At this point, we will be considering the few students who earned under 80% for any assignment/activity to determine if it appears to be an anomaly or if changes need to be made to the course/assignment/activity.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

	<p>of the subject matter; genuine mastery of relevant skills; demonstration of an extremely high level of interpretative and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and achievement of all major and minor objectives of the subject; attends class and participates regularly and appropriately in discussions; supports peer learning. B: Excellent performance indicating a very high level of understanding of subject matter; development of relevant skills to a very high level; demonstration of a very high level of interpretative and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and achievement of all major and minor objectives of the subject; attends class and participates regularly and appropriately in discussions; supports peer learning. C: Satisfactory performance indicating an adequate understanding of most of the basic subject matter; partial development of relevant skills although errors detract from quality of work; adequate interpretative and analytic ability and achievement of all objectives of the subject; failure to achieve some minor objectives; misses some classes but participates in discussions; supports peer learning. D: Limited performance indicating partial</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>understanding of basic subject matter; partial development of relevant skills; some evidence of interpretative and analytic ability; failure to achieve most major objectives of the subject; misses classes and/or does not participate regularly or appropriately in discussions; does not support peer learning. F: Unsatisfactory performance indicating an inadequate understanding of the basic subject matter, failure to develop relevant skills; insufficient evidence of interpretative and analytic ability; and failure to achieve major and minor objectives of the subject; misses classes and/or does not participate regularly or appropriately in discussions; does not support peer learning.</p>			
<p>3. Candidates will develop knowledge of research methodologies and ethics as well as quantitative and qualitative approaches and use this knowledge to draft a proposal of an action research project (G3, G4, G5)</p>	<p>Candidates drafted a proposal of an action research project after applying multicultural educational theories and best practices to identify, define, and solve problems in teaching & learning contexts</p> <p>EDUC 775, Action Research in Education</p> <p>See the attached rubric.</p>	<p>Scores of 80% and above on the action research project.</p> <p>Include a rubric with the report</p>	<p>Spring 2020 (N=3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of students 100% = 2 • #of students 80-99% = 1 	<p>In the previous year, most candidates developed knowledge of research methodologies and ethics as well as quantitative and qualitative approaches and used this knowledge to draft a proposal of an action research project.</p> <p>For the quality of the course contents, we asked the tenure-track faculty member (i.e., Dr. Steven Hayden) who has interest of research and field experiences to teach the</p>

				<p>important course for the long-term reputation and goal.</p> <p>This time, we only had three students for the course, EDUC 775. We will advertise the course for candidates who need to take before their graduation as the course is the culminating experience course for our program.</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):

- 1) Cohort Sizes = about 10 (It varies each semester though as we accept students three times per year.)
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention = 50%
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate: NA (e.g., we started this program four years ago. The cohort size was 9 last year and became 10 this year. I reviewed Blue Reports for two hours, but I could not find out the right number of the graduation rate each year such as 2019 and 2020.)

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

For the most part, our students appear to understand and complete assignments/activities at a high level. We need to investigate whether the few who score between 70 and 80% had personal issues or curricular issues. If they were curricular issues, we need to make changes to the curriculum/coursework.

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

For the coming year, we will focus on sharing this data and the best way to make corrections for the coming year. The information will be shared during faculty meeting(s). This is the fourth year of this program. I created the Teams site, “Teaching and Learning Master’s degree Program.” I set

up the monthly meeting to discuss any advising and course rotation issues with graduate committee members and advisors to focus on the retention and better services for the current graduate students.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email.

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?)**
- 2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
- 4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

We are initiating these three goals as a first step to an organized ongoing process of continuous quality improvement for the Teaching & Learning MEd program. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), through its Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), developed model core teaching standards that outline what teachers should know and be able to do to ensure that every K-12 student reaches the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce in today's world.

1) The Med program Assessment Plan and Rubric has enabled students to demonstrate the following 4 standards of InTASC:

- a. Learner and Learning Environment
- b. Content & Content Application
- c. Instructional Practice
- d. Professional Responsibility

We believe that these goals will positively impact student success by providing consistent monitoring of student progress which will ultimately provide for both a stronger bond between advisors and students as well as having a pro-active approach to scheduling issues that could lead to delayed graduation. For instance, for the curriculum, graduate advisors and I discuss the best way to interact and communicate with graduate students' learning contents and environment. We have discussed the best platform for the on-line classes such as using Zoom, Yuja, Kahoot, Mentimeter, Google Meet, and/or Microsoft Teams and endeavored to find out the most appropriate ones for the target population. For the content and content application, we have required the field-based research practice and discussed how to apply the knowledge from each class into the current field and environment. For the instructional practice, we have carefully designed

assignments for the individual or a small group projects or presentations to lead the class contents. For the professional responsibility, we have kept the attendance and the confidentiality of research sites & participants and discussed netiquette in the on-line discussion and classroom settings.

4) Findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)

Based on the assessment data, students have demonstrated the knowledge necessary to create, use, assess, and manage theoretical and practical applications of Teaching and Learning and processes in real classroom settings. Student work samples and action research based academic papers can be provided as evidence that learning is improving.

5) What your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

In the coming year, I will contact the course instructors and discuss the Assessment Plans and Rubrics by aligning InTASC Standards to the course learning outcomes. I will carefully assess and evaluate whether the courses reflect on the implementation of the InTASC standards. The program will be looking at the Assessment Plan (both the Student Outcomes and all relevant indicators to determine student success) in an effort to ensure that the program will continue to meet the needs of students and the requirements of department, university and state.

6) How this information will be shared with other stakeholders

This information will be shared with Teaching and Learning Master's degree program committee members and graduate advisors. The information will be also shared through course announcements, social media/email communications, website news, school meetings, social events, and professional development workshops with other stakeholders.

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: M.Ed. Teaching & Learning	Overall Rating: Mature (2.81/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are highly compound, which can make measurability a challenge; however, accompanying rubrics are provided that demonstrate the wide range of outcome dimensions for evaluation. • Learning outcomes are aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes to demonstrate their rigor at a graduate level. • Selected measures are generally well-aligned to provide accurate data on student performance of outcomes (see recommendations for exception). • Expected and actual student performance are clearly described. • Provided rubrics are comprehensive and align with dimensions described in the rubrics for the most part. • Good information is provided about further investigation into underperforming students, especially since this is such a small number in the program. • Clear information is provided about upcoming plans to align outcomes with InTASC standards and ensure the assessment plan will provide the needed information to show achievement in alignment with these standards. • Faculty are involved in the assessment process, and clear information is provided about how results are shared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes are highly compound, which leaves room for missing aspects of student performance in the assessment process. For example in EDUC 775 students may only display their knowledge and application of one research method rather than demonstrating proficiency in quant and qual methods as the outcome describes. This doesn’t mean the outcome is poor or the measure is poor – it just means that an additional measure, possible from methods exams, article critiques, etc. might be helpful in supplementing the measure to fully demonstrate performance of the outcome. • The measures used for Outcome 2 are somewhat unclear. Are the reported data reflective of the score on the Curriculum Analysis Project of 300 points, or do they also include the Student Evaluation overall score? If the former, the data may not accurately reflect the breadth of the outcome – students can define terms, but does this reflect their ability to view the “historical and current perspectives” and “examine and articulate multiple approaches to curriculum development and implementation” as described in the outcome? It may be necessary to include data from a second assignment to demonstrate full and accurate student performance on this outcome. Taking data from multiple assignments is more helpful than taking, say, an overall course grade, because it allows you to align those assignments very specifically to parts of the outcome so you can disaggregate the data to understand performance more specifically and tailor any responses.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider reporting findings based on dimensions on the rubric to uncover any subtle areas for improvement within students' overall performances. |
|--|--|

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<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>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<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 (in one case – see notes), 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>

<p>Analysis & Results</p>	<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. <i>(in one case – see notes)</i></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>
<p>Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</p>	<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 if 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 in provided.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Developing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped</p>

Please see reviewer notes for more details.