

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19** *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**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>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.</b></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>The program examined and worked up analysis only on results for 2018 and 2019 (ytd). Only two areas, Government and Psychology exceeded the 80% threshold—Government with 100% passage rate and Psychology with an 83% passage rate, both exceeding the state-wide average. Economics was close at 75%, right at the state-wide average. History only achieved a 44% passage rate, well below the ideal 80% and also below the state average of 62%. Geography might seem the worst at a 38% passage rate, but that actually beat the state average of 35%. Only one student took and passed the Sociology exam. Additionally, the data allows the program coordinator to examine performance data on specific</p>	<p>As noted in last year's report, the program coordinator has pushed through advice to advisees (he sees every advanced SSE student) and in SSE methods classes that he teaches, that students attempting these exams must put in extra time to prepare for them. The coordinator also consulted with Geography faculty in the department of Earth and Environmental Systems to inform them of the dismal results and receive their assurance to more regularly offer pointedly geography-based courses on a more normal rotation. The coordinator will continue to monitor potential weak areas within the subjects noted in the previous column. The state will be transitioning to a new licensing exam provider (thankfully), so year-to-year</p>

			<p>themes within the subject tests, so that potential weaknesses could be spotted. Economics completers seemed weak on the market economy. History completers were weak on World and Indiana History (more below), while PSY completers could be stronger in cognitive and abnormal subjects.</p>	<p>comparisons will be problematic for the next couple of assessment cycles, however, monitoring of potential weak areas should continue.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 12 students were assessed during this past academic year. There were a concentration of “Exceeds” in History and Government/Civics standards, some of which owes to the fact that the SSE methods classes focuses on those areas, allowing for more experience and examples to be transferred to the classroom clinical experience of SSE student-teachers. There was also a gratifying number of “Exceeds” across the disciplinary and thematic standards for the resource category, which indicates that student-teachers took to heart the oft-repeated need to bring in as many outside resources as possible to augment instruction.</p>	<p>This is only the second iteration of assessment utilizing a more detailed rubric. The key areas that the coordinator will monitor with this assessment are the skills categories (i.e. measurements of how well students integrate activities and assignments utilizing outside resources and requiring inquiry-based tasks and critical thinking of their own pupils in the clinical classrooms; can they plan and execute such practices effectively and at high standards). Thus far that appears to be the case (a high preponderance of “exceeds” ratings) at least for History and Government classes. The SSE program coordinator will continue to monitor whether or not more should be done to encourage such in other areas, although Economics was also very strong, though this owed more to the high</p>

				quality students in that area during this cycle.
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 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 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.	Twelve student-teaching evaluations were received for the Spring 2019 semester. Overall there were not as many “exceeds” in this cycle as in previous cycles, although I don’t consider this something of which to become alarmed. Overall in the high school disciplines, student teachers earned a higher percentage of “exceeds” compared to “meets” ratings (well-above 50% of evals earning exceeds in both planning and teaching). Our student-teachers overall appeared better at actually teaching (more exceeds than meets) than planning as rated by their host teachers.	No “red flags” or alarms appear in this data. Student teachers continue to demonstrate solid performance.
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. One can look at our outcomes library for rubrics on what is expected for an “exceeds” compared to a “meets”. Overall the main difference is how many of pupils improved significantly during the course of their clinical teaching experience and how well the student teacher self-evaluated his/her performance.	Space does not permit a summary of how students performed in all 15 of the different NCSS thematic and disciplinary standards evaluated. Suffice to say that all achieved a “meets” or “exceeds.” Overall 12 students were evaluated during this assessment cycle, with about a 50/50 split between those earning exceeds and meets on this assessment—better in History and Government categories.	Again no alarms emerge from this data. SSE students consistently do a good job of collecting evidence and self-evaluation.

<p>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 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>These exams are administered in SS 306 taken during the Fall semester of each year.</p>	<p>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 expectations aside from the expectation that all students pass the exams.</p>	<p>A cohort of 10 students were assessed this past year. Students this year performed the best on Economics (80% exceeds) and Government (60% exceeds), with all the other content areas around a 40%-60% split respectively between exceeds and meets ratings.</p>	<p>With the exception of the high performance on the Economics exam, the breakdowns conform to past performances on this assessment instrument. Geography seems to be a weak area, something that conforms with performance of program completers on Assessment #1. As stated above, during this past year, the program coordinator took what steps he could to try to address shortcomings with the delivery of the Geography courses. This will be monitored</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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- 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.
- 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.)
- 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    2) Year-to-Year Retention    3) 5-Year Graduation Rate
- 1) Enrollments in the SSE major, as measured in the Fall, have trended distinctly upward in the last four years. The # of SSE majors in the Fall of 2016 and 2017 totaled 75 each year. That total jumped to 90 in the Fall of 2018 and has remained at that relatively high level, totaling 87 for the Fall of 2019.
- 2) The year-to-year (Fall-to-Fall) retention rates, by class for SSE majors from the Fall of 2015 through the Fall of 2018 have remained stable and consistently best (with some anomalies) the CAS retention rates. For example the freshman retention rates for the last four years have ranged from a low of 66% to a high (2x) of 73%, but this consistently beat the CAS average that ran in the low 60% range. Sophomore retention was 78% in 2015, 80% in 2016, 79% in 2017 and 85% in 2018, all of which out-performed the CAS average. Junior retention was 87% in 2015, 95% in 2016, 84% in 2017 and 95% in 2018, all except the 2017 number exceeding the

CAS average. Finally, senior retention ran at 100% in 2015, 85% in 2016, 66% in 2017 and 100% in 2018, where the CAS average usually ran in the upper 60% range.

- 3) The 5-Year graduation rate of SSE majors over the last 5 years, based on the cohort start term has been: 52%-FA2010; 50%-FA2011; 47%-FA2012; 54%-FA2013; and 41%-FA2014, all of which out-performed the CAS average.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

*All of the metrics, except for the 2014 cohort 5-year graduation rate appear healthy. Advising within the SSE major continues to be one strong point, at least among the factors that a program can control. The coordinator will continue to place an emphasis on the midpoint survey of majors every year (a deep-dive surveying whether the readiness of sophomores and juniors to make it over the mid-point hurdle of BCP I acceptance).*

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

*I am disappointed that the graduation rate shows a decline for the 2014 cohort. As noted in previous reports, one of the pointed activities that the SSE Coordinator has undertaken has been to review SSE majors with 90+ hours in order to help facilitate getting to the graduation finish line, so it is disappointing to see this metric go down after trending up. The program coordinator will continue to conduct this review and hope for improvement in that graduation trend.*

### **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**
- 
- 1) **As noted above with regard to program assessments, SSE students this past year particularly have improved in how they plan to integrate inquiry/primary source based activities and in bringing outside resources into the classroom (ASS. #3). As evidenced in Assessment #4, host teachers rated SSE student teachers over 50% of the time in high school-level courses at the “exceeds” rate in their planning and teaching capabilities. Program completer performance on the state licensing exams continues to be a weak point, particularly in History and Geography. Analyzing sub-themes within content areas exams, showed several weak areas, or areas that could be stronger, some of which I noted above, such as World History, abnormal psychology. I should note that such analyses also showed some area where I worried our program might be weak—such as physical geography or subject methods (as a part from social studies methods), proved to be incorrect, and they actually were program strengths compared to state-wide performance averages. I noted above what steps I have and will continue to take on that regard, but I should note here that plans of action will of necessity have to pause with regard to the licensing test. This past summer the state of Indiana (I believe the IDOE) decided to**

begin to transition away from the current provider of the licensing exams, Pearson Publishing. I have complained consistently in these reports and to the ISU licensing officer in the BCOE that the Pearson administered exams in SSE licensing areas were horrible, and I am gratified that FINALLY someone at the state level has listened to the cacophony of complaints that have cascaded on them since practically the beginning of Pearson's administration. For assessment purposes, however, it will mean a time of transition, and we will have to wait a couple of new cycles/years for new data. Career readiness and learning within the major overlap at many points. I continually preach, for instance, that teaching is leadership essentially, and students get training on such things as leadership, collaboration, professional work ethics, etc. during their 2 clinical teaching experiences (CIMT 301/302 and CIMT 400/400L) and their semester-long student teaching experience (CIMT 401/402). Additionally the SSE program tries to prepare them for several career-readiness attributes in SS 305 and SS 306, the most obvious of which is an assignment on cover-letter and resume writing for an education job.

- 2) 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) SSE assessment attention will remain focused on key outcomes just noted in #2, but with continued attention to licensing exam outcomes and an analysis of sub-themes within the content area exams that can point to programmatic issues. The program will continue to assess all five of the assessments.
- 4) The SSE Coordinator will communicate with department chairs or relevant curriculum committees of affiliated departments (Economics, Earth and Environmental Systems, Political Science, History, Psychology and Multidisciplinary Studies for Sociology) in order to share particularly the results of the licensing exams and the more narrow areas of weakness and strength relevant to the curriculum provided by these affiliated departments.

***Please prepare this report as a Word document.*** Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Dan,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 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 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)

<b>Program: B.S. Social Studies Education</b>	<b>Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable.</li><li>• Use of scores from licensure exam provides important point of reference against which to compare student performance while in the program.</li><li>• Courses and assignments used for assessment are clearly described. Assessments are taken throughout the curriculum, yielding discrete data points from different perspectives.</li><li>• Clear information is provided about expected and actual student performance, and a sophisticated analytical rubric was used to assess student performance relative to CAEP NCSS standards.</li><li>• Excellent analysis and use of findings. The discussion about state licensure test scores, content area performance within the major, teaching performance, and teaching evaluations provides a rich set of data from which to triangulate inferences and view student learning. Your findings also support your critique of the Pearson exams, and I'm grateful for you that the state has decided to make a change. Your recommended actions for addressing low-performing areas and monitoring performance through the transition to the new licensure exams are thoughtful.</li><li>• Great information about how faculty are involved and how assessment information is shared.</li></ul>	<p>Just a couple minimal recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For assessments 1 &amp; 5, make note of a learning outcome attached to these. They are great assessments for useful points of data.</li><li>• The rubric sounds great. If you would attach to reports in the future, I would love to see it.</li></ul>

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable. (outcomes 1 &amp; 5 are written as assessments rather than outcomes)</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>