Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program Name: ___Social Studies Education__ **Contact Name and Email** _Daniel A. Clark, Dan.Clark@indstate.edu_____

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Content Area Pedagogical Knowledge (SPA-NCSS, Assessment 3)	Scoring Rubric (see attached) SS 305 and SS 306	All students need to rate as "meets" expectations. The coordinator gages cohort/program performance by the percentage rating exceeds or meets.	See Attached (below)	Daniel A. Clark, SSE Program Coordinator Via email and SSE Advisory Council Meeting.
2. Practice Content Area Test (SPA-NCSS, Assessment 6)	Score SS 306	Each student must pass each test with a score of 70%. The coordinator gages cohort and program performance based on the percentage of students who pass the test on their first tries.	See Attached (below)	Daniel A. Clark, SSE Program Coordinator Via email and SSE Advisory Council Meeting.
3. NCSS-Standards Based Teaching Evaluation (SPA-NCSS Assessment 4)	Teacher and Supervisor of student teaching using a rubric (see attached) Student Teaching	All students must rate as "meets" expectations in all categories. The coordinator gages cohort and program performance based on the percentage attaining "Exceeds."	See Attached (below)	Daniel A. Clark, SSE Program Coordinator Via email and SSE Advisory Council Meeting.
4. State Licensing Test (SPA-NCSS Assessment 1)	Test Scores Post-graduation	To maintain state accreditation programs must achieve an 80% passage rate in each testing area.	See Attached (below)	Daniel A. Clark, SSE Program Coordinator Via email and SSE Advisory Council Meeting.

PART TWO

The Social Studies Education Program at ISU is accredited through the CAEP-National Council for Social Studies (NCSS). For the NCSS SPA report, we collect data on 6 assessments. Yearly, however, the coordinator collects and will assess for the ISU yearly assessment report, information on 4 of the 6 NCSS SPA assessments, noted above. The SSE program has not yet developed a "soft" assessment (e.g. exit survey) such as the ISU Assessment office is demanding, but we will take steps to implement such an instrument in the coming year.

1. Two central issues arise from this year's examination of the data. First, and most seriously, is the on-going concern regarding SSE program completers' performances on the state Pearson licensing exams. Second, while taking satisfaction that our students can develop engaging activities in their lesson planning and teaching, the data indicate a lack of enthusiasm in translating such engaging activities into critical thinking activities and assignments and into formal assessments.
2. There is not much that the program can do immediately regarding the performance of ISU SSE program completers on the state licensing exams. Alterations to the History specialization meant to instill more rigor have already been implements. The program will need to monitor scores to see how the lowering of cut scores impacts our program performance. Once I became aware of the difficulty of the exam, I began warning our students about it. I have consulted with both members of the Psychology and Sociology faculty regarding the advisability of one of their members taking the state licensing exams in their respective content areas in order to further ascertain if any curricular changes need to be made.
3. In the coming year, the program will continue to monitor the state licensing test scores carefully. Principally with regard to the licensing exams, the coordinator will advise graduating students to study harder and to strongly consider purchasing a Pearson practice exam, as these seem to help. The coordinator will continue to work with faculty in Psychology, Sociology and Geography to consider alterations to the curriculum in each of these content areas. The instructors in both SS 305 and SS306, will be advised regarding the need to press students in their lesson planning to develop more critical-thinking formal assessments.

Since the SSE website has not developed a URL link for assessment data, a separate attachment accompanies this report containing the data for the four assessments performed for this year's assessment report.

Degree Program: BS in Social Science Education Date: 8.25.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	**Level 1 – Developing**	**Level 2 – Mature**	**Level 3 – Exemplary**
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☒ No outcomes are identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. ☒ Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☐ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☐ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☒ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☒ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☒ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☒ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☒ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

			☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☒ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	☐ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	☒ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important

	plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☒ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☐ **Level 1 - Developing**	☒ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   I am satisfied that the program has learning outcomes, but they were not listed in the report, and I cannot locate an Outcomes Library or a Curriculum Map that might fill in the blanks for me.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program uses four key measures to assess student performance, unit plans, a practice content area test, student teaching evaluations, and the state certification exam. Each clearly is connected to its related outcomes, and standards for achievement are appropriately high.

3. **Results**
   Very amply detailed, thoroughly analyzed results indicate that students are meeting the program's expectations. The appendix includes clear numerical results but also explains what the results mean in terms of what students specifically know and can do well (and less well). Where weaknesses are identified (as in the need to increase student teachers' emphasis on critical thinking activities or improve their history, geography, and psychology test results), at least general plans for action are described.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   One person is identified as having responsibility for collecting and analyzing results that are shared with an interdisciplinary advisory committee on what I assume is a regular basis. The report demonstrates that the program has a very solid, data-rich assessment program. This is no small feat given the breadth of the curriculum.

   Let's make this easier on you next year. I am most interested in evidence that you are collecting meaningful data that provides specific direction for developing plans to improve student learning; that you're following through on those plans; and that students are meeting the program's expectations and continuously improving. I believe you can condense the appendix into the actual report and still tell me what I need to know.

   I hope your SPA report is going well, and I look forward to learning more about your student learning assessment program next year!